

STORYTELLING AND TRUTHTELLING:
DISCURSIVE PRACTICES OF NEWS-STORYTELLING
IN TRUMAN CAPOTE, NORMAN MAILER, AND JOHN HERSEY

A Dissertation

by

JUNGSIK PARK

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

May 2006

Major Subject: English

STORYTELLING AND TRUTHTELLING:
DISCURSIVE PRACTICES OF NEWS-STORYTELLING
IN TRUMAN CAPOTE, NORMAN MAILER, AND JOHN HERSEY

A Dissertation

by

JUNGSIK PARK

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee, David McWhirter

Committee Members, Katherine Kelly

Jimmie Killingsworth

James Aune

Head of Department, Paul Parrish

May 2006

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Storytelling and Truthtelling:

Discursive Practices of News-storytelling

in Truman Capote, Norman Mailer, and John Hersey. (May 2006)

Jungsik Park, B.A., Sogang University;

M.A., Queens College, The City University of New York

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. David McWhirter

Focusing on new-journalistic nonfiction novels by Truman Capote, Norman Mailer, and John Hersey, this dissertation conceptualizes the discursive practices of news-storytelling as a necessary matrix of storytelling and truthtelling activities. Despite the dominant postmodern emphasis on storytelling over truthtelling in such disciplines as literature, historiography, journalism, and legal studies, storytelling-in-the-discipline is also constrained by a set of assumptions and practices about what constitutes professional storytelling.

Since news-stories report on events in a public arena where numerous competing stories abound, they are highly aware of other neighboring stories and so relate, compete, and negotiate with other stories to make their stories not merely repetitive but argumentative and re-tellable. As a socially regulated and conditioned discourse, news-storytelling in its enterprise is predicated

upon different sets of discursive authorities, material conditions, and audience expectations, where various facts and interpretations are argued, tested, and judged.

Chapter I briefly surveys the ways in which news-stories' claim to referentiality is problematized and even stigmatized by the postmodern ethos of storytelling. Chapter II then explores the discursive dynamics of news-stories, which arise from the paradoxical status of being simultaneously news and a story. Particularly, this chapter highlights the discursive practice of "source marking" and "counter-storytelling" through which news-storytellers foreground their reliability as able researchers, analysts, and contenders. Chapter III discusses the issue of (inter-) textuality in the vectors of storyteller and the world, and examines how news-storytellers draw on, blend into, and counter competing and neighboring stories to situate their own stories in the web of intertextuality and to reinforce the competency, honesty, and quality of their news-stories. Chapter IV is a historical examination of a "transcript" mode, a particular discursive practice of news-storytellers, through which they try to uphold the empirical status of their news-stories. Chapter V concludes the dissertation by arguing that news-stories provide a clarifying vantage point from which to understand the transactions of historical discourse, where news-storytelling replaces (story) knowledge with argument, poetics with rhetoric, and a story with a discourse.

To Yongsoon Yim

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My name alone is attached to this small achievement, but there have been many others who manned the helm, kept the engine running, and maintained a close watch on the progress of my journey down the dissertation path. I would like to thank Dr. David McWhirter, Dr. Katherine Kelly, Dr. Jimmie Killingsworth, and Dr. James Aune for their professional and emotional guidance as I worked on my dissertation.

I feel so grateful to the administration, staff, friends, and faculty of the Department of English, in particular, Mr. Obed Sanchez, Dr. Marco Portales, Dr. Margaret Ezell, and Dr. Larry Mitchell, who genuinely offered me invaluable advice on parts or the whole of the dissertation.

I also extend my gratitude to An Sonjae Sensengnim, who initiated me to the world of literature, life, and love, and without whose help I couldn't have started this long journey.

Thank you to Dr. David Richter, who sparked my interest in the world of stories and storytelling.

A big thank you to Dr. David McWhirter, who, besides his ingenious input and insightful suggestions, reassured me with a steady, positive outlook, when I struggled to see a way out of a dark and muddled path, and who guided and accompanied me down to the Ph.D. shore.

Thanks to everyone who stayed with me for this long haul.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION: POSTMODERNISM AND THE “OTHER” LITERATURE	1
II STORYTELLING AND TRUTHTELLING: THE NARRATIVE ETHICS OF NEWS-STORYTELLING	11
1. Postmodern Turn in Storytelling	11
2. Poetics and Ethics of News-Storytelling	17
3. Source Marking	23
4. Counter-Storytelling	32
5. News-Storytelling Act	46
III STORYTELLING AND RETELLING: INTERTEXTUALITY AND STORY RE-ENACTMENT IN MULTI-GENRE TEXTS.....	60
1. The Doctrine of Panfictionality	60
2. The Categories of the Text: Narrative, Description, Commentary, and Speech	69
3. Textual Forms as Cognitive and Interpersonal Activities	85
4. Intertextuality	111
5. The Textuality of News-Stories	121

CHAPTER	Page
IV	TRANSCRIBING REALITY: A CASE HISTORY OF THE "TRANSCRIPT MODE" 132
	1. The Diachronization of the Text..... 132
	2. The Conception and Re-emergence of the "Transcript Mode" in the News-Stories of Daniel Defoe and the Later News-Storytellers 141
	3. The Transcript Mode: Its Constituents and Practices 161
V	CONCLUSION: TOWARDS A RHETORIC OF NEWS- STORYTELLING 179
	WORKS CITED 184
	VITA 202

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION:

POSTMODERNISM AND THE "OTHER" LITERATURE

"New Journalistic" stories, grouped under the umbrella term of literary nonfiction, have occupied an uneasy space at the obscure corner of narrative studies—a theoretical dead horse in the literary market, branded with the "referential fallacy." Literary critics have often stigmatized these "new journalistic" stories as too "non-imaginative" and "uncreative" to be considered art, while journalists accused them of being too "subjective" and "biased" to be factual reportage. Under the dubious or even contradictory title, "literary nonfiction," such narratives have been disowned and attacked by their own generic parents—literature and journalism.

While these nonfictional stories have flourished in popular culture particularly since the sixties in the form of autobiography, biography, and memoir, in academia they have neither enjoyed the status of art in the lighted area of creativity and imagination, nor attained the status of factuality and truthfulness as reportage. The double charges against literary nonfiction from

This dissertation follows the style of *PMLA*.

both professions are the reflection of flipsides of the same issue: the genre's problematic claim to referential correspondence and factuality.

Despite the recent upsurge of scholarly attention to narrative, nonfiction has been neglected by structuralist narratologists and resisted by poststructuralist critics as an object of theoretical and methodological elaboration. Some structuralist narratologists such as Gerard Prince and Mieke Bal do not particularly differentiate fiction and nonfiction texts as long as they have narrative structures, while others such as Gerard Genette and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan explicitly confine their study to fiction.

On the other hand, postmodern (pan-)textualists have problematized the boundary between fiction and nonfiction. In *Tropics of Discourse*, Hayden White argues that when "[v]iewed simply as verbal artifacts histories and novels are indistinguishable from one another" (121). Similarly, Linda Hutcheon almost equates history-writing with fiction-writing since historiography inevitably resorts to "narrativization and, thus, to fictionalization" (93). From the same perspective, Phyllis Frus argues that "the experience of reading an invented tale is identical to that of reading a historical one" (160). All these arguments share the poststructuralist assumption that language is a closed system where signifiers only refer to other signifiers, and that matching the two realms of language and the world is a "confusion of referent and meaning," or at best what Barthes calls "anaphoral" — a simple

clash of two incommensurable structures (“Historical Discourse” 154; *The Fashion System* 7).

My dissertation proposes to explicate the storytelling practices, discursive distinctions, and theoretical principles of literary nonfiction through three “new journalistic” stories: Truman Capote’s *In Cold Blood* (1965), Norman Mailer’s *The Armies of the Night* (1968), and John Hersey’s *The Algiers Motel Incident* (1968). I will construct my arguments from a narratological perspective through the convergence of several disciplines, such as linguistics, critical discourse analysis, rhetoric, historiography, legal studies, and speech act theory. Importantly too, I implicitly attempt to respond, for the sake of a tangible exposition, to the dominant literary history of postmodernist storytelling, the protagonist of which is metafiction. That story, as conventionally told, runs something like this:

Once upon a time in America, reality turned out to be unreal, strange, and incomprehensible. Upon witnessing the ineffable reality, a group of writers decided not to *write the world* but to write about *the impossibility of writing it*. These writers openly acknowledged their act of writing, questioning narrative constructions and literary conventions of the time, and interrogated the problematic relationship between language, reality and fiction. They were called “fabulators.” Another group

(or the foil) tried to cope with the dilemma, still clinging to the much problematized notions of “truth” and “reality,” despite the crumbling relationship between language, the world and knowledge. They were realists, historians, and documentarists.

This is the story of an emerging discourse of the sixties told by the critics of metafiction such as Robert Scholes (13), Raymond Federman (7), and Linda Hutcheon (5). Though simplified for the sake of framing the discussion, the story seeks to encapsulate how the new discourse of the postmodern has been identified and constructed in relation to language, reality, and historical knowledge, and, more importantly, to nonfiction.

The newly emerging discourse, or fabulation, to use the term with which Robert Scholes tried to “provide a new name for these new literary artifacts” (14), has been variously called “surfiction,” “metafiction,” “transfiction,” or “postmodernist fiction,” with varying emphasis. For Hutcheon, “historiographic metafiction,” which explicitly focuses on the border between fiction and history, is a serious candidate for a new discourse of postwar America in that it critiques and destabilizes any “analytico-referential discourse” of totality, objectivity, and realism, and pursues a discourse of discontinuity, plurality, and indeterminacy (75). Discrediting “grand narratives” of totality and universality, Jean-François Lyotard calls for “a new genre of discourse [in which] a multiplicity of possible, probable, and

improbable stories are told" (*The Differend* 148), or simply for "A Postmodern Fable" which is free of "the direct constraints of its exploitation of making, knowing, and know-how," "the merely realist constraints," or "the verification/falsification constraint" (*Postmodern Fables* 95). In the discussion of the new novelistic discourse of the sixties, some critics like Christopher Norris and Fredric Jameson have expressed some suspicion towards its historical and political implications. For instance, Christopher Norris warns of "its uncritical adherence to a theory of language and representation whose extreme anti-realist or skeptical bias in the end gives rise to an outlook of thoroughgoing nihilism" (191). For Fredric Jameson, the "new aesthetic mode itself emerged as an elaborated symptom of the waning of our historicity" (21). Within various attempts to define and evaluate the new discourse called metafiction, the generally shared argument is that it "self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artifact" and "explore[s] the possible fictionality of the world outside the literary fictional text" (Waugh 2).

In discussing and debating the conditions and values of the new discourse, however, what is broadly termed nonfiction has often been antithetically exploited as a foil to fiction, or narrowly approved, in certain cases of literary nonfiction, because it meets the postmodern ethos of plurality, subjectivity, and indeterminacy. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, for example, Mikhail Bakhtin identifies history with monologic discourse, which posits an

unproblematic world, “objectifies all reality” and “pretends to be the last word” (107, 318). Working along the lines of Bakhtin, Julia Kristeva claims that though dialogism is inherent in language itself, it is subdued by a censorship in historical discourse (71).

Whereas history has often been positioned alongside fiction antithetically, as a foil, a number of literary nonfiction texts, particularly the “new journalistic” stories, were used for a different purpose. Their discursive practices – questioning and subverting “official” stories, displaying decisive subjectivity and indeterminacy, or exposing illusory reality – were validated and acclaimed according to the interpretive polemics of postmodernism. That is, literary nonfiction is subsumed to the metafictional model. Hutcheon, for instance, differentiates (and thus saves) “a kind of overtly personal and provisional journalism, autobiographical in impulse and performative in impact,” exemplified by Norman Mailer’s *The Armies of the Night*, from “a modern rewriting of the realist novel – universalist in its assumptions and omniscient in its narrative technique,” the example being Truman Capote’s *In Cold Blood* (115).

No doubt, the postmodern ethical and aesthetic commitment to subjectivity, plurality, and indeterminacy, as illustrated in metafiction, has been an effective corrective to the long and oppressive reign of realism and its metaphysics of “presence.” What is worth noting is that both metafiction and

nonfiction have been repeatedly and even obstinately examined in terms of their stance toward historical facts and knowledge—the former seen as subverting them, and the latter affirming them. However, focusing on one facet of multidimensional functions of stories, that is, on their referential status, distorts more than it clarifies the relationship of stories to the world at large. I would like to argue that the postmodernist concern with stories, whether in metafiction or in literary nonfiction, has been narrowly located and overstated in and around the issue of referentiality.

If Hutcheon forcefully and effectively problematizes the notion of the representation of reality by pitting the “historiographic metafiction” that “deliberately falsifie[s]” historical records and “acknowledges the paradox of the reality of the past” against the “historical novel” that pretends to be real with “an air of dense specificity and particularity” (114); if she convincingly proposes a new historical discourse of provisionality and indeterminacy by highlighting “overtly personal and provisional journalism” over realist nonfiction; and if her “historiographic metafiction” sensitizes us to the problematic of historical facts and knowledge by questioning the conditions and values of them; then I would like to note that all these efforts and investments have come at a price. Critical practice has been all too eager to polarize the various stories according to the pronunciation of self-reflexivity, plurality, and subjectivity, as opposed to realism, linearity, and (pseudo-)

objectivity, and, by so doing, it has flattened the paired other – nonfiction stories – into a stock character of monologism, universality, and totality, excluding other multifarious and heterogeneous dimensions of those stories.

My dissertation explores the argumentative aspect of the “new journalistic” stories, or what I refer to as “news-stories,” and examines how those news-storytellers tried to do things with their stories. Though critical discussions have long revolved around questions regarding the referential aspect of a story, confirming or subverting theories about language and reality, storytelling involves multi-dimensional functions – interpersonal, competitive, expressive, and illustrative. In short, news-storytelling is rarely exclusively referential in nature. Because news-stories report on events in a public arena where numerous competing stories abound, they are highly aware of other neighboring stories and strive to relate, compete, and negotiate with other stories to make their stories not merely repetitive but argumentative and re-tellable.

For instance, Norman Mailer retells the Pentagon March to counter the story in *Time* magazine, where he was portrayed as a snobby and shameless “scatological solo.” Mailer further argues that his eccentric story “elucidate[s] the mysterious character of that quintessentially American event” better than factual reportage. John Hersey’s *The Algiers Motel Incident* contends against the sublimated racist stories of the Police, the National Guard, and the Court

hidden under the cloak of Law and Order and further competes with *The Report of The National Advisory Commission On Civil Disorders*, which, though “frank” and “remarkable” in Hersey’s opinion, “didn’t face up to the implication of its own historic accusation.” Capote’s *In Cold Blood*, while aware of the nation-wide consensus on penalizing the bloody and inhuman crime in Holcomb, Kansas, nevertheless stars Perry, the murderer of the Clutter family, as a socially victimized and failed romantic figure, and uses Perry’s story to criticize the prejudiced process of the legal system—the flawed process of the *voir dire* examination, the M’Naghten rule, and negligent and conspiratorial lawyers.

By bringing up the argumentative ethos of the news-stories, I am foregrounding the storyteller who purports to argue with a story, the immediate social context of the story event, and the storytelling activity to influence and change the world the story is addressing. Throughout the dissertation, I highlight this aspect of story/storytelling interaction, analyzing a news-story more as a social practice than as a text and more as a working than a work. The purpose of highlighting the storytelling act over the story itself is to relocate the discussion of textuality from theories of sign and language to the practices of textual engagement, and to elucidate the specifics of the uses of texts in news-storytelling activities.

While interest in and the practice of literary nonfiction have steadily increased, a more sustained and in-depth theoretical investigation is long overdue. Since Dennis Rygiel's call for criticism on nonfiction in "On the Neglect of Twentieth Century Nonfiction" in 1985 and Eric Heyne's call for theories in "Towards a Theory of Literary Nonfiction" in 1987, there has been little effort to theorize literary nonfiction. Heyne observes over a decade later, in 2001, that though "the practice of various kinds of 'creative nonfiction' has proliferated...and surely theory would follow practice...Unfortunately, it hasn't happened" ("Where Fiction Meets Nonfiction" 323). Gerard Genette, the champion of contemporary narratology, later confessed his "own guilt" in that he "manifestly limited [*Narrative Discourse*] to fictional narrative" and "repeat[ed] the offense in *Narrative Discourse Revisited*," redefining his works as an "excessively one-sided practice" and "*restricted narratology*" (*Fiction and Diction* 55-56).

My dissertation proposes a rhetoric of news-storytelling through Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*, Norman Mailer's *The Armies of the Night*, John Hersey's *The Algiers Motel Incident*, and other related news-stories. By explicating the argumentative dimension of the news-stories and the story/storytelling interaction, my dissertation will help to make a step forward towards a much-needed "Nonfiction Narratology."

CHAPTER II

STORYTELLING AND TRUTHTELLING: THE NARRATIVE ETHICS OF NEWS-STORYTELLING

1. Postmodern Turn in Storytelling

In *The Postmodern Condition*, Jean-François Lyotard uses the term “grand narrative” to refer to the kind of overarching story that legitimizes its own world-view by drawing on a metaphysics of truth and knowledge (xxiii). The underlying order of the world and the way it operates are systematically explained by historically eminent stories such as the Marxist story of class struggle and proletarian utopia, the Enlightenment story of reason and human emancipation, or the Christian story of the fall, redemption and a final judgment. In the postmodern era, as Lyotard suggests, these great stories are losing their explanatory grip on the world, giving way to numerous little stories that locally and provisionally validate knowledge (xxiv).

The demise of these great stories and the emergence of little stories are reflected by, or coincide with, an upsurge of interest in (auto-) biographies, memoirs, diaries, and other personal story-forms in recent decades, not only in literary studies but also in many academic fields of the humanities. According to Martin Kreiswirth, the little stories left an indelible impression across the

disciplines in the humanities, “displac[ing] argument and explanation in a whole range of recent philosophic, theoretical, and cross-disciplinary contexts” and offering “a kind of space for a redescription of the social, political, and even perhaps philosophical that the grand narratives [...] closed off” (637, 640).

The impact has been most evident in the profession of history that has always told stories at a national, ethnic, or social level. As Georg Iggers observes, the “narrative turn” triggered the fragmentation of the great stories of a nation and people, dislocating the storytelling practice from “Macro- to Microhistor[ies],” from “the ‘center’ of power to the ‘margins,’ to the many” (102). Increasingly, historians came to see “history no longer as a unified process, a grand narrative in which the many individuals are submerged, but as a multifaceted flow with many individual centers” (103). Historiographic practice came to fragment its profession in a more pronounced way than ever in subject and perspective, telling the stories of marginalized groups such as native-Americans, women, immigrants and dissenters, and the stories of individuals through such forms as biographies, memoirs, and diaries.

Particularly since the sixties, the profession has tended to discredit omniscient and supra-perspective narration of a nation and people, and to valorize the practice of particularized storytelling, bringing forth “a seemingly bewildering outpouring of specialized histories” and “the eclipse of state-centered political history” (Patterson 188). The fragmentation in history, in

Olabarri's estimation, now made any "attempt to create synthesis ... practically impossible" (15).

Another profession that has been punctuated with the impact of little stories is legal studies. While the profession bases the understanding of legal issues on deductive logical reasoning, or what Daniel Farber and Suzanne Sherry called "grand theory" that operates in an apparently "abstract, objective, and empirical" way, legal storytelling came to serve as "the antidote" to legalistic abstraction: it provided the profession with "both the individualized context and the emotional aspect missing from most legal scholarship" (811). Due to its widespread availability, storytelling was a particularly salient recourse for the marginalized and the oppressed. For instance, the stories of African Americans' pain and rage made their experience vividly known to white readers and shattered the mindset of "presuppositions, received wisdoms, and shared understanding" (Delgado 61). Legal storytelling, observes Richard Delgado, has become both a powerful means to restructure the professional practice and a vital part of legal scholarship (61).

While little stories are recognized as a remedy to totalizing stories and theories, and even celebrated as alternative sources of lived experience, insight, and knowledge, we shall recognize that they also harbor the original sin of *being* a story: they cannot guard against the epistemological blindness and narrative distortion they consciously and unconsciously foster. Stories

interpret the past to justify their present, and the present to argue for the future, acting as their own witness for the meanings and significance they inscribe. Lyotard later acknowledged “an uncriticized metaphysical” rationalization among current narratologists to exempt little narratives from “the crisis of delegitimation” (*Postmodernism Explained* 20). As Kreiswirth observes, rushing to champion little stories, many current narratologists as well as Lyotard imposed “an incredibly heavy burden—epistemological, social, political, even ethical—on little narratives” (643). If grand narratives legitimize their world by drawing on metaphysical grounding, little narratives affirm themselves by devising their own “pragmatics” in representation and interpretation (44). As Kathryn Abrams argues, stories deploy their own indicia by creating “a complex, highly particularized account of an experience” and stabilize the meaning and ideology of the world (807). By mixing knowledge, experience, and desire, and creating a sense of necessity—sadness, anger, or happiness—stories constitute the self-explanatory and self-evident world. That is, story-referentially speaking or at the level of story dimension, a story is “true” as long as it is maintained by the logic it creates and the drama it unfolds—as long as it is a *good* story.

As a matter of practice, historians and lawyers are tempted to, and even strive to, produce good stories. Though the legal profession is committed to finding truth and enforcing justice, as Jerome Frank explicates, the logic of

legal procedure is not necessarily truth-investigatory and truth-inquiring but often adversarial and partisan; lawyers are not only investigators of truth but also litigators against and negotiators with adversaries (80). As exemplified in the stories of *In Cold Blood* and *The Algiers Motel Incident*, prosecuting attorneys often strategically regulate and obstruct adversarial testimonies to hide certain facts that may harm their clients, and defending attorneys may attempt to discredit opponents' stories, whether true or false, by attacking their credibility as witnesses. The professional legal storytellers often commit themselves less to finding the truth than to benefiting their clients, and try to make their client's story plausible and convincing, while making their opponent's seem faulty and not credible. For this reason, as Richard Posner points out, legal storytelling has always been torn between "the authority of truth" and "the charm of fiction," sometimes by yielding to the "invention of facts, and only a little less culpably the omission of facts" (303).

In historiography, the conflict between storytelling and truth-telling has been more pronounced. Philippe Carrard, Ann Rigney, F.R. Ankersmit, and Hayden White, among other historians, perceive historiography as necessarily poetic by nature. According to Hayden White, histories are always already aestheticized through "emplotment" that transforms "the chronicle of events" into "a comprehensible drama" (*Metahistory* 67). Historians cast the past in a story-form such as romance, comedy, tragedy or satire, and ground it in one of

the more basic master tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche or irony (72). Robert Berkhofer in the same spirit declared that the current “demystification of a historical enterprise” made it possible for historians to exercise as many equally legitimate stories as possible from various perspectives (151-152). The majority of historians, however, share the sentiment of Gertrude Himmelfarb, who deplores the current “allure of creativity, imagination, [and] inventiveness” in historiography (170). Himmelfarb believes that narratologist historians make the profession “less of a ‘discipline’ and more of an impressionistic ‘art’” (171). The struggle between storytelling and truth-telling in the aforementioned professions and the humanities in general seems to be escalating since the postmodern storytelling practice openly discredits the belief in referential truth, as Brian McHale announces in a nutshell: “the world is finally inaccessible, and all we have are the [narrative] versions” (*Constructing Postmodernism* 4-5).

Despite the emphatic support for storytelling for story’s sake, storytelling-in-the-discipline is also constrained by a set of assumptions and rules that constitute the normative practice of professional storytelling. “New journalistic” stories, or “news-stories,” are a particularly apt exemplar of storytelling that showcases the dilemmas and dynamics between storytelling and truth-telling activities. While bound by the institutionally structured practice and the codes of reportage – an obligation to referential accuracy,

foundation of verifiable data, and constraints of time limit (to be newsworthy) – news-stories also push to the limit the creative and writerly flair of storytelling, experimenting with various literary and novelistic techniques. In this chapter, I will explore the distinctive dynamics of news-storytelling, both at the textual and discursive level, that arise from their paradoxical status of being news and a story at the same time.

2. Poetics and Ethics of News-Storytelling

News-storytellers are engaged in the precarious enterprise of telling about others, both the living and the dead. What is at stake is not only the individuals staged in their story world but the authors themselves who have to live with the consequences of their storytelling – from a personal complaint of the staged individuals – “It wasn’t that way at all,” “I didn’t say that,” or “That’s simply not true” – to more complicating confrontations such as lawsuits for libel and defamation. Depending on the significance and the potential of the confrontation, news-storytellers either tolerate or yield to the challenge, being pulled back and forth between the necessities of a good story and a true story.

When faced with Elizabeth Taylor’s threat for libel for the lines he put in her mouth in *Marilyn*, Mailer ran to Eli Wallach, the source of information, to

confirm the lines and secured “twelve witnesses” who would stand by the lines. Sometimes Mailer had to moderate certain lines to avoid a lawsuit for libel, for instance, by Arthur Miller, who was described as having “lived off and invested Marilyn’s earnings” (Manso 553). Capote was more recalcitrant. Though agonizingly torn between “the attractions of Society” he mingled with and the true-life story that might “banish him forever from his favorite world,” he rarely responded to the request (Grobel 199). Richard Hickock, the original instigator of the crime and a “truly serpentine” figure in *In Cold Blood*, and several other characters staged in his news-story, “desperately” asked Capote for changes, without much success (Plimpton, “The Story” 34; de Bellis 532). Capote was sued for defamation by Gore Vidal and involved in a one-million-dollar lawsuit, which terminated his friendship with Vidal for good. A scene where Capote staged Marlon Brando and his mother infuriated Brando, afterwards, never “grant[ed] any in-depth interview for over twenty years” (Grobel 102). Though Capote was fully aware of the consequences of his true-life story and possible legal complications, the dilemma, nevertheless, was that “[the scene] was the whole key to everything that [he] had done” for the story (102).

The aesthetic decision Capote made, at the sacrifice of his relationship with others or at the cost of possible distortion of others, brings to the fore the question of the (mis-) use of facts for poetic purpose – the ethics of

aestheticizing the real world. Language leaks into reality and binds lives to it. Creative mind and sleight of hand can turn out to be malicious and do injustice to the world. The characters in a true-life story do not only inhabit, and constitute part of, the story world, but can be further referred to and traced back to flesh-and-blood individuals. The news-stories may be helpful for some and harmful for others; they can be like any other readings for some, or disastrous for others, because they enact the world of a drama inhabited by heroes, villains, friends, and betrayers.

If *In Cold Blood* was creative in form and fascinating in content as an art, it was just as often construed as morally problematic and even criminal. Kenneth Tynan regarded *In Cold Blood* as “the legal strangulation of his [Capote’s] friends,” the two criminals who confessed everything in their hearts in trust, and claimed Capote’s betrayal of the trust of Perry and Dick was as “cold-blooded” as the blood shed in *In Cold Blood* (131). For some critics, Capote was a literary shark, “exploiting tragedy for personal gain” (Trilling 109). Hersey estimates that, though a “richly talented” storyteller and a Pulitzer prize winner with his *The Armies of the Night*, Mailer with another news-story, *The Executioner’s Song*, had fallen to a mere “media vulture,” scavenging on “Gilmore’s remains” (13). For Bryan Griffin, *The Executioner’s Song* was an “anti-human” crime, for Mailer distorted Gilmore, a shameless murderer, into a glorified hero (19).

One of the most socially disturbing cases of winning one over the other, a good story over a true story, took place in institutionalized journalism. Another, if short-lived, Pulitzer prize winner Janet Cooke printed "Jimmy's World" in the Washington Post on September, 1980 to raise the awareness of the drug problem in Washington. As designed, Jimmy's life story galvanized the whole nation because the story had all the drama of a fated tragedy: an eight-year-old drug addict Jimmy, whose world is full of "hard drugs, fast money, and the good life he believes both can bring," another drug addict mother, Andrea, who embraces her son's addiction as "a fact of life," and Ron, a drug dealer and mother's live-in lover, who "turn[s] Jimmy on" by regularly injecting heroin in him. To give narrative coherence and continuity to the original story that involved too many drug addict characters and issues, Cooke created "Jimmy," a convenient composite figure that has all the elements, effectively reducing the complexity of the narrative. This extreme case of sacrificing the factual aspect of the news-story in favor of a more dramatic intensification later caused a forfeit of the prize, and became the epitome of the worst kind of reportage. Storytelling and truth-telling, or fiction and fact, were often felt to be contradictory, as Capote complained that "art and truth are not necessarily compatible bedfellows," and can even be seen as detrimental to each other, as Hersey observes: "The blurring...has not been particularly good for fiction; it may be mortal to journalism" (de Bellis 535, Hersey 1).

While the middle course is not always clear and successful, the news-storytellers are acutely aware of their expected role as reliable reporters and of the socially-binding dimension of their stories. Negotiating their ground between art and life, and fiction and journalism, they often manage to underscore the factual status of their stories and their ethical commitment as reporters. Truman Capote subtitles his narration as “A True Account of a Multiple Murder and Its Consequences,” and, in the “Acknowledgment” section of *In Cold Blood*, establishes the foundation of the story on his “own observation,” “official records,” and “numerous interviews conducted over a considerable period of time.” He highlights the labor of six years in and out of Holcomb, Kansas, which produced “eight thousand pages of pure research.” Later in the interview with Lawrence Grobel, Capote uses his research to disqualify Mailer’s *The Executioner’s Song*, a book that distinctively lacked a foundation of that scale (112).

John Hersey in *The Algiers Motel Incident* suspends his story temporarily to announce his “decision” to forsake novelistic devices — “the luxury of [authorial] invisibility,” “all-seeing eye,” and “creative reconstruction.” That is, he demotes himself from an “all-knowing novelistic mind” to the all-too-human position of a reporter, the measure of which, he argues, is to avoid the “merest suspicion that anything had been altered, or made up, for art’s sake, or for the sake of effect” (26-27).

Norman Mailer later decided to add to his novel "The Novel as History," the reportorial counterpart, to "balance his view of himself and events with other accounts of the march" and to demonstrate "an impartiality in his scrutiny of both the leftist and the establishment press" (Rollyson 204). It was "almost an afterthought" of Mailer's to secure "an objective historical voice that complements his third-person [novelistic] treatment of himself in the first part" (204).

In news-storytelling, as John Hellmann points out, the textual import of reportorial "honesty and trustworthiness" is inseparable from "the aesthetic effect" and in fact affects the overall "critical evaluation" of the news-stories (29). Mailer, Capote, and Hersey, to varying degrees and in various manners, seek to establish the ethos of the trustworthy reporter. As Mas'ud Zavarzadeh rightly claims, news stories function "simultaneously [at] self-referential and out-referential" levels: they are "self-referential" because they exercise "the aesthetic control associated with works of art," and "out-referential" in remaining "externally verifiable" (57). To secure the authority of a socially reliable reporter, the news-storytellers try to accommodate and even foreground the "out-referential" dimension, often at the cost of the aesthetic continuity of the stories. With two distinctive (inter-) textual phenomena of what I would call "source marking" and "counter-storytelling," I will examine the "out-referential" interruption, or disruption that ensures the external

verifiability of the story – the intertextual practice which is driven by rhetorical demand, rather than aesthetic necessity, which affects the composition and dynamics of the news stories.

3. Source Marking

One of the most pronounced “out-referential” storytelling practices is “source marking.” By “source marking,” I refer to the storyteller’s textual mediation that identifies his source of information and knowledge, or what discourse analysts call the “evidential marker” or “discourse quotative”: “Linguistic evidentiality [that] codes the way speakers acquire knowledge of the information they talk about” (Mushin 927, Winter 5). To ascertain their credibility as reporter-writers, the news-storytellers identify, to varying degrees, the sources on which they constructed the news-stories, tagging such source markers as “according to” adverbial phrases and “he said” reporting clauses. Mailer’s *The Armies of the Night*, Capote’s *In Cold Blood*, and Hersey’s *The Algiers Motel Incident* – all display an astoundingly extensive network of sources on which they predicate their stories, and make explicit the material context and retrospective nature of narrative construction.

While the source marking practice varies in form and frequency, Hersey is most consistent – or persistent – in labeling and interweaving his narrative

with source tags in seamless and straightforward ways. In *The Algiers Motel Incident*, typical reportorial tags such as “according to” prominently run through the tapestry of narrative incidents with striking frequency, as in “According to *The New York Times*” (31), “according to his testimony” (39), “according to J. Anthony Lukas” (45), and “according to Luedtke” (49). In contrast, Capote presents the source markers in such a way as to minimize their visibility. Reluctant to explicitly unveil the story-telling facet, he embeds the markers in the narrative to foreground the actions of the story, as in “Perry could not imagine ‘anyone smart enough to cheat that kid,’ he said later” (239), “Remembering it later, his wife said...” (240), “...Where upon, he later wrote in a formal report...” (253), and “Dick...was (he later recalled) equally eager to converse with Perry” (257).

Capote resists the more intrusive marking of the storyteller’s presence, believing that “for the nonfiction novel form to be entirely successful, [the signs of] the author should not appear in the work” (Plimpton, *Truman Capote* 203). That is, for Capote, the aesthetics of news-stories require that the signs of storytelling activity be kept at a minimal level; the writer’s task is to make the story world “shown” rather than to have it told, to use the traditional vocabulary of Percy Lubbock (62). Although Capote tried to make the mediator of the story invisible, he also felt obliged to found and construct the story world in accordance with, and in fidelity to, the logic of a ‘real life’

epistemology. In other words, he was hesitant to give the impression of distorting his sources of acquired knowledge and of resorting to an all-knowing novelistic perspective – to avoid all too human questions such as “how could you know the information without making it up?” and “how could you possibly know this?”

The challenge of nonfiction aesthetics is to maintain the reality effect of the story world while at the same time securing the credibility of the storyteller’s knowledge. For Capote, the dilemma, “technically, was to write it without ever appearing [him]self, and yet, at the same time, create total credibility” of the claimed world (203). Apparently, one attempt to solve the dilemma was to inscribe his presence, as the witness to the event and as the source of information, in the story world without explicitly designating his presence or by camouflaging himself as a bystander, an anonymous nobody, such as “a journalist,” “a reporter,” “a friend,” and “an acquaintance” in the following examples: “‘Sometimes, I cover sixty miles a day,’ he said to an acquaintance’” (76); “While this was being done, Hickock’s father, addressing a journalist seated near him, said, “The judge up there! I never seen a man so prejudiced’” (316); “The allegation, which was untrue, irritated the detectives into expounding very convincing denials. (Later, in reply to a reporter who asked him why he had dogged this artificial scent at such length, Hickock’s lawyer snapped...)” (321); and “‘That was a cold night,’ Hickock said, talking

to a journalist with whom he corresponded and who was periodically allowed to visit him" (371).

After the perusal of Perry Smith's mind in psycho-narration where the storyteller wields a special or supernatural access to the thought of the character, Capote adds a segment of dialogue in the following passage and inscribes himself as a witness, thus identifying the source of knowledge or foundation of his speculation about the criminal's mind.

Perry destroyed the card, but his mind preserved it, for the few crude words had resurrected him emotionally, revived love and hate, and reminded him that he was still what he had tried not to be – alive. "And I just decided," he later informed *a friend*, "that I ought to stay that way. Anybody wanted my life wasn't going to get any more help from me." (my italics 358)

Once, in response to those who doubted and questioned Capote's accessibility to the knowledge of a scene where Nancy, one of the four Clutter family victims, was alone – "How can you reconstruct the conversation of a dead girl, Nancy Clutter, without fictionalizing?" – Capote vehemently argued back: "If they read the book carefully, they can see readily enough how it's done... Each time Nancy appears in the narrative, there are witnesses to what she is saying and doing – phone calls, conversations, being overheard" (208). While suppressing the visibility of the source markers, he also claimed that he

qualified the information in the process of his own storytelling. That is, he immaculately “reconstructed [the story] from the evidence of witnesses,” and in fact managed to deploy various evidential indicia of sources, implicitly and explicitly, in dialogues and narrative, and even implicated, as he claims, “in the title of the first section of the book – ‘The Last to See Them Alive’” (207-208).

While these source markings disambiguate the very process of finding, retrieving, and incorporating the textual and extratextual information, they certainly impede the fluency of narrative progression and diminish the effect of an autonomous world, where events occur and develop on their own. If Capote tries to suppress the intrusive source identification, while still preserving those source markings at the minimally visible level, Hersey unleashes those evidential markings throughout the story and seriously damages the fluency of his storytelling, almost countering the editorial claim of “a dramatic act-by-act reconstruction.” Whereas source marking is a dilemma and a nuisance for Capote when making a realistic crime story, it serves Hersey as leverage for exchanging the reality effect of the story for what he regarded as more desirable – the factuality and documentarity of the story.

What follows is the ‘escape’ scene of Afro-American survivors, Michael Clark, Lee Forsythe, James Sortor, Roderick Davis, and Larry Reed, after the traumatic violence at the Algiers motel, where three other friends, Carl, Aubrey, and Fred – or reportedly, three “Negro snipers” – were killed (16).

They were seized at the motel by the policemen, coerced with questions and threats, and, leaving the bodies of friends at the motel, ordered to walk home with “hands above [their] head” and without ever “look[ing] back” to avoid being shot from behind (3).

After a couple of blocks Roderick peeked around behind to see if another friend was following them. He ran and caught up with Larry.

“Did you see Fred?”

“No,” Larry said. “Fred’s still in there.”

Lee Forsythe and James Sortor, two others who had been in the line, joined up and ran together toward Carl Cooper’s house, a mile and a half away. *Carl’s stepfather, Omar Gill, told me later of Lee’s account of the flight.* “He said he run and he crawled. He say he went down Clairmount, he say he come down cutting through yards and things down to Clairmount. They was stopped at Twelfth and Clairmount and beat again. They were hit again.” *Sortor told me later that* somewhere during the evening, probably here on the street, his wrist watch was pulled off over his hand and twenty dollars were taken from his pocket. They were sent on with hands up. (my italics 4-5)

Hersey here persistently identifies the source of information and places a witness statement in his narration, a narrative strategy not untypical in *The Algiers Motel Incident*. By marking the reporting actions at an explicit level (“Carl’s stepfather, Omar Gill, told me later” and “Sortor told me later”), he presents the story less as a reported event than as a reporting event. Hersey explicitly verbalizes the story-delivering and -telling process, in which the original story, “Lee’s account,” is embedded in Omar Gill’s story, and then lodged again in Hersey’s storytelling. The constant ‘he-said-she-said’ double (sometimes, triple) sourcing, twice or thrice removed from the event, drains the urgency and immediacy of the event, and diminishes the effectiveness of a suspenseful and enticing crime storytelling. For instance, when Hersey narrates Eddie’s encounter of his brother’s body at a morgue, he identifies the whole process of “getting to” know the news: “Larry Reed’s father called the Temples very early that morning to say that someone had called to tell him that Fred Temple had been killed at the Algiers Motel. [...] ‘This,’ Eddie told me, ‘was the first I’d heard of the nature of the incident’” (20). That is, the “someone” told Larry Reed’s father about Fred Temple’s death; Reed’s father then told the Temples about it; and Eddie Temple, Fred’s oldest brother, later told John Hersey about the news. In another instance, Hersey’s first encounter with the Algiers murder news from a lawyer is introduced with a sourcing, embedded in another, and then still another: “On Friday, July 28, Allen Early

told me, a client called him and said he knew somebody who knew something about the Algiers killings” (40); “Somebody” told Early’s client about the Algiers killings; Early’s client told it to Early; and Early told it to Hersey.

What is distinctive in Hersey’s narration is that the storytelling act prevails over the story, or the narrating act dominates over the narrated event throughout *The Algiers Motel Incident* – at the serious risk of losing track of the storyline itself. When Hersey presents “Miss Gilmore’s story,” the key story of the murder from the only eavesdropper, “Clara Gilmore” (the receptionist and switchboard operator of the Algiers motel), he arduously explicates the path by which the story came into being. First, Hersey introduces “Miss Gilmore’s story,” in which “[Miss Gilmore] had seen an Army jeep and three or four police cars park on the west side of Woodward, right in front of the office [of Algiers]. Several men in uniform took cover behind trees.” Later “she heard several shots” and “cut into A-3 and found the line open. She heard someone yell, ‘Get your hands up.’ Someone else shouted, ‘Watch out!’ – and something about grabbing a gun. Then, hearing several shots, she panicked and pulled the plug” (12). After the story, he traces the way it came to light – an extravaganza of story transmission.

[Miss Gilmore] and Williams then sat talking fearfully about what was going on. Hendrix [“the owner of the private-guard firm”], having heard her story [...] called the Wayne County

Morgue to report the deaths and to ask that the cadavers be taken away. Marvin Szpotek, a clerk at the morgue, telephoned the Homicide Bureau of the Detroit Police Department and told Detective Joseph Zisler. [...] Detective Zisler set in motion a radio command, which was picked up at about two o'clock in the morning by Scout Cars One, Two, and Seven from the Thirteenth Precinct (13),

And so on, until Detectives Hay and Lyle Thayer finally “took down Miss Gilmore’s story.” The persistence of tracing this story-delivering and -telling process is, however, a textual instance of Hersey’s reportorial burden on the still on-going Algiers motel incident, as he explains:

“[B]ecause I was all too aware that the truth had not always been told me, and indeed had not always been spoken under oath in court, I would have to let you, the reader, know at every step of the way exactly who was speaking, and to whom, and under what circumstances. (27)

Hersey is fully “aware that [his] reliance in this narrative on the statements of witnesses tends to fragment the story,” but, being over-burdened by the unprecedented scale of human attrition and sacrifice during the riots, he forsakes telling a *good* story (225).

An intriguing and entertaining crime story traditionally consolidates a series of developing actions and consequences into a unique form of a drama, while suppressing irrelevant facets and informative trivia of the story that may impede the realistic story's unfolding. Nonetheless, "in a story involving...such terrible cross currents of jeopardy and of desire for justice and safety and revenge," his only hope, Hersey argues, is to make "[fewer and smaller] mistakes" and not to pretend to be "objective" — the reason he had to give up the "all-knowing novelistic mind" and the "luxury of invisibility" (27). The spectacles of the source markings and the pronounced concern for narrative fragmentation, however, are less the admittance of a failure or lack of imagination and creativity, than the reflection and, in fact, rigorous assertion of the acute sense of a socially responsible reporter. In other words, Hersey's disclaimer of his account not being a good story serves as leverage for lifting the other side of news-storytelling — his commitment to telling a true story that testifies to the crisis and deprivation of human dignities and social injustice.

4. Counter-Storytelling

Another distinctive "out-referential" practice of news stories includes varied modes of intertextual activity in which the storytellers analyze, interpret, and examine competing stories in order to argue for their own

version of the reality – a practice which I would like to conceptualize as “counter-storytelling.” As the prefix “counter-” (“contrary” and “complementary”) implies, counter-storytelling does not necessarily mean only “storytelling against other stories” but also refers to “storytelling with neighboring stories” to support one’s perception of the reality.

In recounting the experience of the Pentagon March in October 1967 in Washington, D.C., Mailer tries to disqualify other competing stories that totalize the experience of the march based on predetermined political agendas. “The Old Left,” in his estimation, would read into the event its own script of “brickwork-logic-of-the-next-step” (102). “The New Left” would make up a revolutionary story with “its political esthetic from Cuba” in mind (109). “The Black Militants,” following their own imperatives, pursued a different story to express “their reluctance to use their bodies in a White War” (120). For the White House, it was simply a story of “irresponsible acts of violence and lawlessness” (316).

Though political parties rush to render a meaningful story with historical significance attached to it, for Mailer, the Pentagon March, being amorphous and ambiguous, resists being neatly storied. He believes that the competitors’ story-schemata would unvaryingly fail, for their ideological apparatuses are too precise and rigid in estimation and interpretation. The systematic clarifications of the march are in fact a distortion because the

Pentagon March, the event “so odd and unprecedented” with “monumental disproportions,” defies any brilliant and clear-cut storification, the process of constructing a story out of real events (68). Countering those political stories, Mailer argues that the eccentric event requires a narrator as the ex-centric figure, and stages in his storytelling “an eyewitness who is a participant but not a vested partisan...ambiguous in his own proportions” – “a comic hero” (67).

The Algiers Motel Incident is a full recycling of other stories in an attempt to solve the mysterious murder at an Algiers motel during the Detroit Riots of 1967. For Hersey, the motel incident clearly indicates a racially-motivated murder of three black adolescents by three white policemen. By juxtaposing and comparing the emotional and vivid testimonial stories of the victims with impersonal legal stories, which sanitize and regulate the experience and emotion of testimonial stories, Hersey tries to discredit the legal discourse, which does not see “race” as a factor in the murder. The law enforcement systems perceive the civil disorder only in terms of control and collapse of law and order; the event can only be described as a “generalized breakdown of law and order” (11) and “anarchy” (96).

Hersey criticizes the point-of-view-less and race-blind perspective of the systems of law. Against the normalized and neutralized legal story, Hersey chooses to tell little stories of victimized people and circulates them

aggressively in his story to great effect. He believes that what will change the world is not a legalistic “high task of seeking truth,” bureaucratic programs, or any abstract institutional measures, but these little stories ridden with bitter emotion and personal experience, which will saturate the minds of men with “pity and terror” (30). Hersey uses his story as a corrective to legal principalism and to the moral cul-de-sac of abstractive norm-based approaches to the Algiers motel incident.

Lastly, *In Cold Blood* can be aptly characterized as a discursive arena where various disciplinary stories clash, grapple, and compete with each other, forming what Foucault called a “dossier” — “a case, an affair, an event that provides for the intersection of discourses that differ in origin, form, organization, and function” (x). To make sense of the cause and consequence of the chilling mass murder without “motive” that took place in Holcomb, Kansas in 1959, Capote draws on various disciplinary stories: medical explanations about insanity and competency to stand trial, legalistic discourse on crime and social responsibility epitomized in the M’Naghten rule, the detective story of “Crime and Punishment” personified in the KBI (Kansas Bureau of Investigation) agents, Al Dewey and Nye, etc. Comparing and relating various neighboring stories and discourses, Capote attempts to produce a meaningful narrative out of this mysterious murder in terms of motive and manner.

As shown in *The Armies of the Night*, *The Algiers Motel Incident*, and *In Cold Blood*, news-storytellers rarely present their own version of the incident directly but rather actively engage other stories to appropriate and attack the world-view position of their competitors. At the textual level, *In Cold Blood* borrows about “half of the text” from other stories in the form of narrative summary, news report, interviews, diaries, and other documents – the language of others (qtd. in Algeo 81). *The Algiers Motel Incident* incorporates far more neighboring stories or intertexts than *In Cold Blood*; *The Armies of the Night* fewer. All three storytellers recycle other competing and neighboring stories, heterogeneous in origin and desire (as the “copyright” statement in *In Cold Blood* recognizes that “All letters and quotations are reprinted with the permission of their authors” in a paratextual domain) in their pursuit of retelling the same event. By counter-storytelling, reporter-writers attest to their reportorial reliability and credibility by demonstrating the scope and depth of knowledge and awareness for public concerns and interests relevant to the issue. Counter-storytelling is an intertextual practice that highlights the argumentative aspect of news-stories by commanding a broader view of an incident and rigorously assessing the context of the news. I will illustrate with Mailer’s *The Armies of the Night* the counter-storytelling dimension in which the storytellers’ ability and reliability as an able researcher, analyst, and contender is foregrounded.

From the beginning, *The Armies of The Night* explicitly poses a contra-angle to a *Time* magazine story, where Mailer was portrayed as a snobby and shameless “scatological solo” protagonist. Readers are thus guided into the story world that Mailer’s competitor created:

From the outset, let us bring you news of your protagonist.

The following is from *Time* magazine, October 27, 1967.

A Shaky Start

Washington’s scruffy Ambassador Theater, normally a pad for psychedelic frolics, was the scene of an unscheduled scatological solo last week in support of the peace demonstrations. Its antistar was author Norman Mailer, who proved even less prepared to explain *Why Are We in Vietnam?* than his current novel bearing that title. Slurping liquor from a coffee mug, Mailer faced an audience of 600, most of them students, who had kicked in \$1,900 for a bail fund against Saturday’s capers. ‘I don’t want to grandstand unduly,’ he said, grandly but barely standing. (13)

After the description of the scene and Mailer as a character, the *Time* magazine story turns to the scene of the Pentagon march for the rest of the article: the point of the telling is, in short, that Mailer was unprepared and irrelevant to the event all along, “[s]lurping liquor from a coffee mug” from the beginning and “[m]umbling and spewing obscenities” on the stage. At the end, when it

came to the time of action that “shifted to the Pentagon, Mailer was perky enough to get himself arrested by two Marshals” hastily and anticlimactically before the real confrontation took place (13-14). Apparently, Mailer rushed to be copped before the “civil disobedience” action actually erupted, which Mailer does not deny in his version of the event: he chose to be arrested the easy way because “the thought of Mace in his hard-used eyes inspired a small horror” (70) and because he wanted “to get back to New York in time for their dinners, parties” (137). The mock-heroic tone of the *Time* magazine story clearly depicts Mailer as an irrelevant and inconsistent farcical character, with his equally incompetent duo of friends, poet Robert Lowell who, “at the request to speak louder,” just couldn’t make himself heard to the audience, and critic Dwight Macdonald, who stood “aghast at [Mailer’s] barroom bathos, but failed to argue Mailer off the platform” (14). The *Time* story highlights a wide disparity between the collective purpose — “in support of the peace demonstration” — and Mailer’s irrelevant act to cope with the situation. The story is designed to disrupt the balance between what Mailer says and what he actually does, making the act unfit, impotent, and absurd for the purpose of the march.

After perusing the story, Mailer gets out of the competitor’s story world (“Now we may leave *Time* in order to find out what happened”) and offers his own version, which functions as an expanded critical footnote to *Time*’s story.

He re-contextualizes the kernel scenes — say, the drunken scene, the obscenities scene, and the arrest scene, among others — and re-describes them point by point and act by act. The selected scenes of the *Time* story are re-enacted as kernel episodes respectively in the chapters, “Toward a Theater of Ideas” (40-43), “A Transfer of Power” (55-66), and “A Confrontation By The River” and “Bust 80 Beyond the Law” (149-158).

Mailer’s persona becomes an overriding lens that perceives and organizes the event. The Pentagon March from the beginning to the aftermath was an ambiguous event that harbored heterogeneous sentiments, agendas, and people: “hippies,” “lawyers,” “accountants,” “Reform Democrats,” “Women Strike for Peace,” “Inter-University Christian Movement,” “Jewish Peace Fellowship,” “Students for a Democratic Society,” “The Resistance,” to name but a few (111). From this perspective, the event never had a shared value or goal in the first place; rather it was a formative and transforming event, the meaning of which the sterile and unimaginative language of *Time* could not ever fathom. Mailer, now a comic protagonist “monumental[ly] disproportion[ate],” is an effective prism through which we can view and better understand a series of incidents — the drunken scene, the obscenities scene, and the arrest scene — and, further, the absurd and schizophrenic event of the march itself

Against *Time's* story about the scenes, Mailer redescribes his version of these events in the remaining chapters. Bourbon was a creative bloodline for his brain that gave "a cerebrative edge; words entered his brain with the agreeable authority of fresh minted coins" (40). He kept "taking a sip of bourbon...to keep all fires idling right" for his "existential" encounter with the audience (41-43). To be properly sensitized and ready for the existential moment is to be bourbon-stimulated. As to the "little obscenity" he offered to the audience on the stage, he claims that one should find "no villainy in [his] obscenity" but "humor" (60-61). What are villainously obscene are Lyndon Johnson's hypocritical words at odds with his deeds:

[T]he American corporation executive, who was after all the foremost representative of Man in the world today, was perfectly capable of burning unseen women and children in the Vietnamese jungles, yet felt a large displeasure and fairly final disapproval at the generous use of obscenity in literature and in public. (63)

Concerning the arrest scene, which the *Time* reporter turns into farcical bathos by terminating it with the voluntary arrest of the protagonist, Mailer conceptually redesigns it as a beginning of his metamorphosis, far more symbolic and spiritual than anticlimactic and personal; the "picayune arrest" was "his Rubicon," a step, and a gate to face the ultimate evil at the heart of a

corporate Empire: “he was in the land of the enemy now, he would get to see their face” (151, 157).

One of Mailer’s most compelling and persuasive strategies against the *Time* story, in my view, is to stage the very competitor, the *Time* reporter, in his redefined story world. Upon the first encounter of his foe, Mailer introduces him to the readers as a “young man from *Time* magazine” and assumes him to be “a stringer” because the young man “lacked that I-am-damned look in the eye and rep tie of those whose work for *Time* has become a life addiction” (43). “The young man,” Mailer argues, “had a somewhat ill-dressed look, a map showed on his skin of an old adolescent acne,” and then in a quicker and louder tempo he rounds off his characterization: “he gave off the unhappy furtive presence of a fraternity member on probation for the wrong thing, some grievous mis-deposit of vomit, some hanky panky with frat-house tickets” (43). It isn’t long before that the reporter is brought to the stage again – this time to “the scene [where he introduced Mailer as] an unscheduled scatological solo” in the *Time* story. Now, in Mailer’s version, Mailer on the stage asks all the reporters to stand for the audience in the theater and, further, for the nation, and no one responds to the call except “One lone figure” from the “Washington *Free Press*” – “some student or hippie paper” (64). Mailer is ticked.

‘Ah want *The Washington Post*,’ said Mailer in his best Texas tones, ‘and the *Star*. Ah now there’s a *Time* magazine man here

for one, and twenty more like him no doubt.' But no one stood.

So Mailer went into a diatribe. 'Yeah, people,' he said, 'watch the reporting which follows. Yeah, these reporters will kiss Lyndon

Johnson's *ss and Dean Rusk's *ss and Man Mountain

McNamara's *ss, they will rush to kiss it, but will they stand up in public? No! Because they are the silent assassins of the

Republic. They alone have done more to destroy this nation than any force in it.' (64-65)

By Mailer's estimation, the *Time* reporter was no actor in history but an invisible bystander and, further, one of "silent assassins of the Republic." The *Time* reporter is no longer an impartial and reliable narrator, but a flawed human character. By staging the reporter in his own narrative, Mailer reduces the narrator to a character, undermining the reporter's narratorial reliability. At the core of Mailer's counter-storytelling (against the *Time* story) is the redefining of the significance of the event by realigning the series of incidents to the rhythm of his experience and perspective; his counter-storytelling prioritizes the story-as-experience over the story-as-information, the actor's language over the spectator's.

Appraising the significance of, and closing his story of the Pentagon march at the penultimate chapter, "The End of The Rite," Mailer acknowledges that "the immediate beneficiary of the March" is ironically Lyndon Johnson:

the march raised Johnson's popularity by "ten percentage points" and turned the general public's sentiment against the demonstrators. Mailer, lastly, engages the official story of the march by Lyndon Johnson:

I know that all Americans share my pride in the man in uniform and the civilian law enforcement personnel for their outstanding performance in the nation's capital during the last two days. They performed with restraint, firmness and professional skill. Their actions stand in sharp contrast to the irresponsible acts of violence and lawlessness by many of the demonstrators. (316)

Mailer does not altogether contradict the president's observation, but concedes the violent acts and raised popularity with qualifying remarks: "There were, however, only a few" and "it seemed that public sentiment had turned sharply against resistance. The Negro riots had made the nation afraid of lawlessness" (317). In the following passages, Mailer reconstructs President Johnson's story from the opposite perspective of those who committed "irresponsible acts." Ultimately, the "irresponsible acts" of the demonstrators are reread as the symbolic act of praying for the "sins of America" (319). In Mailer's version, the "violence and lawlessness" of the demonstrators (and now the prisoners) are rewritten as and replaced by "resistance," "non-cooperation," and "refus[al]" in terms of the antiwar protest and disobedience discourse.

[I]t was in Occoquan and the jail in Washington, D.C., that the March ended. In the week following, prisoners who had chosen to remain, refused in many ways to cooperate, obstructed prison work, went on strikes. A group from the Quaker Farm in Voluntown, Connecticut, practiced non-cooperation in prison. Among them were veterans of a sleep-in of twenty pacifists at the Pentagon in the spring before. Now, led by Gary Rader, Erica Enzer, Irene Johnson, and Suzanne Moore, some of them refused to eat or drink and were fed intravenously. Several men at the D.C. jail would not wear prison clothing. Stripped of their own, naked, they were thrown in the Hole. (318)

Then, "Several men at the D.C. jail" are transformed in an overlapping image into the praying "Quakers" and "saints" (319). To alter the perception of the march by other competitors and to reinforce his own, Mailer repeatedly engages other stories for comparison, contrast, modification, and synthesis in the representation of the march. By so doing, he promotes the competitive and collaborative quality of his historical knowledge and understanding of the event, and establishes the ethos of a reliable researcher, analyst, and storyteller.

Source marking and counter-storytelling operate at the level of intertextual activity and may be understood as a basic condition of human cognition and conceptualization of an event, which is particularized and

situated in the world. For a news-story to be ethically justified and validated as historical knowledge, it has to be read against competing stories and in relation to neighboring stories. News-storytellers do not merely present their story but interrupt and impede it by drawing on, blending into, and countering other stories. They reinforce the competency, honesty, and quality of their news-stories by exposing the story-constitutive foundation and making them into the object and site of axiological and epistemological investigation. For the news-storytellers, the authorial ethos does consist only in making a good story – in terms of plot, thematic consistency, and stylistics – but also in making a reliable story – disambiguating the storytelling process itself and constructing intertextually competitive stories.

Until now, I have emphasized the “out-referential” aspect of news-stories, which demonstrates the reportorial credibility of the storyteller, and explained the dynamics of news-storytelling as an interactive matrix of storytelling and truth-telling. Though I have contrasted the dimensions and practices of storytelling and truth-telling, I would like to add that the relationship of the two is more dialogic and complementary than contradictory and opposing: intriguing news is delivered by way of good storytelling. Storytelling spices up the facts with a fresh look, and transforms them into a “newsworthy” event. In the same way, a news-story grows and proliferates on the weight of the facts in terms of relevance and accuracy. The two forces of

news-storytelling are not necessarily contradictory; they complement each other.

Concluding this chapter, I will take news-storytelling as an act that binds storytelling and truth-telling activities into a deliberate reality statement towards, and about, the world we live in. By formulating a specific kind of narrative to capture (his/her understanding of) the world, the news-storyteller implicates a specific epistemological and ethical world – the world we would feel happy or sad about, the world with which we may sympathize or condemn, and the world we may find justified or absurd. It is a narrative act, through which the storyteller argues for a specific kind of story world.

5. News-Storytelling Act

The distinguishing characteristic of a news-storytelling act emerges in the wedding of storytelling and truth-telling – at the crossroads of two distinctive, but interrelated modes of knowledge and practice. The ethics of reportage may be most aptly characterized by a quest for “fairness,” variously labeled in institutionalized journalism as “objectivity” and “impartiality” (Smith 81; Willis 58; Keeble 130). That is, news-reporters should get the facts right and be accurate, and should not invent, obscure, or distort the facts in order to make up a story. For John Hersey, the ethics of reportage can be boiled

down to “one sacred rule”: “NONE OF THIS WAS MADE UP” (2). Granting the maxim that “there is no such thing as absolute objectivity,” Hersey immediately argues that journalists would also know when “distortion” creeps in while reporting. They should suppress the instinct for a story — “the worm of bias” wiggling on “the distortion that comes from subtracting observed data and the distortion that comes from adding invented data” (2).

While one path on this crossroads steers its way towards the records of indisputable fact, the other path stretches out to dramatic intensification and personal experience. News-stories should have a ‘tale’ to tell. To pursue a tale, storytellers highlight certain aspects of human experience, and dramatize them into a story of delight, surprise, sympathy, or anger. Without drama of any kind, there is no story. To particularize the experience of the world, news-storytellers craft a plot to encase an event and designate roles for characters to play. Authorial commentaries, well-developed characterization, and a set of meaningfully sequenced actions are the ways in which certain themes or insights about human events are implemented, suggested, and carried out. A typical example that takes a step away from “straight” news and closer to a story is the “news feature.” A news feature, as Bruce Garrison observes, has “a plot” and “characters,” and falls “somewhere between news writing and short stories” (351). The more elaborately, meaningfully, and compellingly the storytellers weave together the variegated and multifarious threads of details,

actions, and incidents, the more the news gains life and depth and takes the form of a story.

The point is well illustrated by two news articles that report on the last minute hearing to stop the scheduled execution of Perry Smith and Richard Hickock, the two main characters of *In Cold Blood*. The attorneys for the convicted killers alleged unfair trials in the past and asked Judge Vance to step down from the case because his possible bias, being a friend of a former attorney, could influence the courtroom decision. Printed on April 7 and 10, 1965 by *The Garden City Telegram*, Kansas, the two articles make two different types of news about the same incident. What follows is a more straightforward news-type report titled "Judge to Hear Appeal Here" (I use a slash to mark each paragraph instead of space in the original source):

District Judge Alex Hotchkiss of Lyndon, Kan., is to be here tomorrow to hear an appeal by Richard Hickock and Perry Smith./ Hotchkiss was appointed yesterday by Kansas Supreme Court Chief Justice Jay S. Parker after the local district judge, Bert Vance, disqualified himself to hear on the motions./ The hearing on the motions will be in Finney County District Court. Motions to have the death sentence and trial set aside were filed here Monday under the new code of civil procedure. The Kansas City

attorneys representing the pair in the appeals are expected here tomorrow.

The news does not aspire to tell a story. It matter-of-factly states what takes place in Garden City: Hotchkiss's expected arrival for the appeal (first paragraph), his replacement of the former judge, Bert Vance (second paragraph), and the nature of the motions for the hearing and the Kansas City attorneys' expected arrival (last paragraph). It unravels the constituent parts of the series of the events in each paragraph and examines each on its own rather than relate and sequence the elements into a drama of human actions and reactions. The news presents itself as a set of information about people, place, time, and incident, and its perception of the world is more static and informative than dynamic and interactive, as is reflected in its heavy use of copulas instead of action verbs: "is to be," "was appointed," "will be," "were filed," and "are expected here." Transforming actions and reactions into inanimate and descriptive states, the news becomes an emotionally neutral or lifeless brief on people and events. Its counterpart, "Seek Stays for Hickock, Smith," constructs a different kind of world by locating the same hearing in a wider context of human intention and conflict.

Attorneys for two convicted killers drove almost across Kansas — Garden City to Topeka — from an unsuccessful hearing Friday in a new attempt to save two men from the gallows. The

attorneys, Joseph Jenkins and Robert Bingham, Kansas City, filed motions in the Kansas Supreme Court just before closing time. They sought stays of execution for Richard Eugene Hickock and Perry Edward Smith, who are scheduled to hang Wednesday for the killings in 1959 of the Herbert Clutter family near Holcomb. Jenkins and Bingham had appeared in Finney County District Court Thursday and Friday to ask an order setting aside the death penalty. Judge Alex Hotchkiss of Lyndon, sitting in place of Judge Bert Vance who disqualified himself, refused the motions to set aside the death sentences. Friday, the attorneys immediately filed an appeal and then drove to Topeka to file motions with the Supreme Court for stays: Hearings on the motion in the Kansas Supreme Court are slated for Monday morning.

The news frames the hearing as a last-ditch effort of the defending attorneys to avoid the scheduled execution, and visualizes the desperate and frenzied attempt through a tellingly appropriate image of driving to and fro across Kansas. The discretely specifiable states in the first news account are redescribed as a drama of motivated actions and reactions, where the attorneys “sought the stays of execution for Richard Eugene Hickock and Perry Edward Smith” and “ask[ed] for an order setting aside the death penalty,” to which the

judge “refused the motions,” and then, in return, “the attorneys immediately filed an appeal” to the Supreme Court. The hearing is a highly charged arena where the seeker and the adversary confront each other. By clarifying the relations of details and characters and by sequencing the series of actions, the news increases its narrativity, or its degree of being a story.

By relating and figuring the news elements thematically into a meaningful whole, a news-storyteller decides on one kind of story over another, and morally commits to the world he or she constitutes. He culls out the details and incidents, weighs the truths and possibilities of the issue, and decides strategies of narrative presentation. It is the very act of storytelling that gives a narrative shape to the world and creates its own epistemological and moral space. When a news-storyteller strives to secure the appearance of a complete story, giving a thematic significance to what might otherwise have been a different story, most of the details may risk fading into obscurity and distortion. Capote, for instance, pushed right up against the border of reportage, and has been particularly vulnerable to the accusation. For example, in a news article about the execution of the two murderers, the following news, “Hickock, Smith Pay Extreme Penalty: Pair Meets Death on KSP Gallows,” appeared in the *Garden Telegram*, Kansas, Wednesday, April 14, 1965. It describes the last moment of Hickock at the execution site in a straightforward manner:

The gallows were built in a warehouse just inside the walls at the southeast corner of the prison. It was chilly inside the high stone walls. Five bare light bulbs, suspended from the peak of the wooden roof, lighted the platform at the top of 13 steps. At the outlet, two nooses were suspended from a large crossbeam built diagonally across the platform. /Warden Sherman Crouse read the death warrant after Hickock was brought in at 12:14 a.m. and Smith at 12:56 a.m. Each was given a chance to say a last word before he climbed the steps to the platform. Hickock addressed his remark — “I don't have any hard feelings” — to the four agents of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation who were listed as assistants to the executioner. /Al Dewey, agent at Garden City, and Roy Church played important roles in the solving of the case. The others were Harold Nye, director of investigations for the KBI, and Clarence Duntz. /The identity of the hangman was not disclosed, but Warden Crouse said he is not an employee of the state. /A few minutes after each man dropped through the trap, a guard stepped to the body and opened the shirt. Dr. Robert H. Moore, the prison physician, listened for heart beats and determined when the men were dead. After each execution, a hearse entered the warehouse and bore the body away.

The article is conveniently segmented topically into four paragraphs by a spacing (slash here), and each paragraph roughly forms a topical unit: description of the gallows, the rituals of the execution (death warrant and last words), introduction of the four agents, identity of the hangman, and the execution. Though minimally a narrative, moving forward through reference time, it does not explicitly attempt to be a story of a particular kind. In marked contrast to this is Capote's dramatic representation of the scene in which he integrates "historical givens," that is, persons, places, and incidents, into a 'mise en scene' with characters, settings, and events and with a predominant picture and quality.

The sudden rain rapped the high warehouse roof. The sound, not unlike the rat-a-tat-tat of parade drums, heralded Hickock's arrival. Accompanied by six guards and a prayer-murmuring chaplain, he entered the death place handcuffed and wearing an ugly harness of leather straps that bound his arms to his torso. At the foot of the gallows the warden read to him the official order of execution, a two-page document; and as the warden read, Hickock's eyes, enfeebled by half a dozen decades of cell shadows, roamed the little audience until, not seeing what he sought, he asked the nearest guard, in a whisper, if any member of the Clutter family was present. When he was told no,

the prisoner seemed disappointed, as though he was not being properly observed. / As is customary, the warden, having finished his recitation, asked the condemned man whether he had any last statement to make. Hickock nodded. 'I just want to say I hold no hard feelings. You people are sending me to a better world than this ever was'; then, as if to emphasize the point, he shook hands with the four men mainly responsible for his capture and conviction, all of whom had requested permission to attend the executions: K.B.I. Agents Roy Church, Clarence Duntz, Harold Nye, and Dewey himself. 'Nice to see you,' Hickock said with his most charming smile; it was as if he were greeting guests at his own funeral. / The hangman coughed – impatiently lifted his cowboy hat and settled it again, a gesture somehow reminiscent of a turkey buzzard huffing, then smoothing its neck feathers – and Hickock, nudged by an attendant, mounted the scaffold steps. 'The Lord giveth, the Lord taketh away. Blessed is the name of the Lord,' the chaplain intoned, as the rain sound accelerated, as the noose was fitted, and as a delicate black mask was tied around the prisoner's eyes. 'May the Lord have mercy on your soul.' The trap door opened, and Hickock hung for all to see a full twenty minutes before the prison doctor at last said, 'I

pronounce this man dead.' A hearse, its blazing headlights beaded with rain, drove into the warehouse, and the body, placed on a litter and shrouded under a blanket, was carried to the hearse and out into the night. (379-80)

Hickock's arrival punctuated by rain-drumming and priestly chanting drapes the shade of his intimidating, impending, and inevitable doom. The dual drum-chant rhythms are soon replaced with the warden's recitation of the death warrant, Hickock's last words, and then the hangman's agitated reaction. The tension culminates at the end of the scene when Hickock "mounted the scaffold steps" as "the chaplain intoned" and "the rain sound accelerated." While this quasi-ritualistic atmosphere produces a sense of heightened anxiety and imminent downfall, what it is contrasted with, and in fact highlighted against, the erratic rain drops and priestly chanting, is Hickock's sustained and controlled posture facing the execution with a "most charming smile," last greetings to his captives, and his wish to have a member of the victims' family witness his death—which strongly suggests his wish to compensate the sense of loss for the Clutter family.

Capote's intention to make Hickock's death sober and respectable becomes clearer when Capote places the execution scene between two revealing dialogues of witnesses testifying about Hickock's transformed attitude and spirit at the last moment. Upon entering the scene of the execution,

readers are provided with Hickock's last wish through the dialogue of a nonchalant witness: "Did you hear about Hickcok's eyes? He left them to an eye doctor. Soon as they cut him down, this doctor's gonna yank out his eyes and stick them in somebody else's head" (379). Then, the execution scene is immediately followed by another scene where Roy Church, his captor, and an unidentified detective converse with each other: "Staring after it [the body], Roy Church shook his head" and uttered, "I never would have believed he had the guts. To take it like he did. I had him tagged a coward." When the detective comforts Church by saying "He deserved it," Church resisted the suggestion, and "with thoughtful eyes, continued to shake his head" (380). Hickock's voluntary donation of his eyes, his sovereign fortitude facing death, and Church's confusion towards the criminal he captured make Hickock's last dying moment particularly enlightened, sober, controlled – and most importantly, human.

In the next scene, describing Perry Smith's death, Capote pushes further beyond the confines of historical parameters and specificity, and complicates the meaning and significance of Perry's life and death. Capote's narration associates the murderer with a fairy child, if deformed in appearance and mischievous in spirit, who strives but is unable to grow up in a hierarchically ordered social world. Perry enters the execution site, "chewing a hunk of Doublemint gum," and winks at Dewey, "his old foe." His fingers are "stained

with ink and paint” for he has been painting “self-portraits and pictures of children.” The scene ends with Dewey’s perspective:

Dewey shut his eyes; he kept them shut until he heard the thud-snap that announces a rope-broken neck. Like the majority of American law-enforcement officials, Dewey is certain that capital punishment is a deterrent to violent crime, and he felt that if ever the penalty had been earned, the present instance was it. The preceding execution had not disturbed him, he had never had much use for Hickock, who seemed to him ‘a small-time chiseler who got out of his depth, empty and worthless.’ But Smith, though he was the true murderer, aroused another response, for Perry possessed a quality, the aura of an exiled animal, a creature walking wounded, that the detective could not disregard. He remembered his first meeting with Perry in the interrogation room at Police Headquarters in Las Vegas – the dwarfish boy-man seated in the metal chair, his small booted feet not quite brushing the floor. And when Dewey now opened his eyes, that is what he saw: the same childish feet, tilted, dangling. (381-382)

Dewey perceives Perry as a romantic figure who, though socially denigrated and damned, tried hard against the odds for his distorted lot. Capote didn’t see in Perry an evil person; he saw “the man he might have

been” — his alter-ego, a twin brother who didn’t have wings to fly and turned to the darker path (Clarke 326). At the closing of the story in particular, Perry Smith appears less as a perpetuator of a ruthless crime finally brought to justice than a fairy child abused and victimized by society, complicating and even superceding its narrative point and genre. Sympathizing and identifying with the murderer’s childhood and his mentality, Capote projects his beliefs, visions, and confusions to the story world, and as Sol Yurick observes, turns Smith and, to a degree, Hickock, from “cold-blooded murderers” to “psychopathic heroes” of the story (qtd. in Hollowell 74).

The two execution scenes demonstrate, in microcosm, a defining process of news-storytelling in which the storyteller implicates (and constitutes) a story world of a kind by attaching meanings and significance, emotions and desire, and values and vision to the empirical world. By storytelling one’s own and counter-storytelling others’ stories, and by endorsing neighboring stories and substantiating his/her own interpretations through others, the storyteller shapes his/her relationship with others — characters, informants, source authors, and readers — and commits himself to the intertextual and interpersonal context of story-configuration. The source marking and counter-storytelling practice, for instance, is not merely an intertextual reference, but, more importantly, an interpersonal and intersubjective activity that defines its authorial stance and role in relation to the world. It is a storytelling act/story

event that takes place in the world and engages in a discursive construction of reality. For this reason, Hersey, at “the risk of distorting or adulterating the legal process” that was on-going for the Algiers motel case, nevertheless, rushed to publish and circulate his story to help the victims whose “lives were at stake in the trials that were pending from this case” (28). Capote deliberately delayed publishing his story “that might have proved detrimental to Smith and Hickock’s chances for a reversal” of the verdict (qtd. in Algeo 101).

News-storytelling as an act is caught up in social relations and exists *in actu* as a socially encultured practice. The news-story acts in a way that tries to make sense of the world we live in, commits the storyteller to the world he/she experienced, and affects the lives of the people staged and defined in the story. Narrative possibilities and professional necessities draw and test the limits and potentials of the representation of real life that the news-storytellers pursue. What binds the poetics and ethics is the storytelling act that integrates into the story world the many and plural social forces and practices that surround an event, bringing into dialogue the teller and the told, the story world and the real world, verbal representation and nonverbal incidents and events.

CHAPTER III

STORYTELLING AND RETELLING:
INTERTEXTUALITY AND STORY RE-ENACTMENT
IN MULTI-GENRE TEXTS

1. The Doctrine of Panfictionality

When Capote was asked about the generic ambiguity of his nonfiction novels, he responded in a way that would be repeated for decades to come: “It’s not really a matter of truth or nontruth. It is really a question of narrative writing, that’s what it’s really about” (Grobel 90).¹ As the revealing subtitle of *The Armies of the Night*, “History as a Novel, The Novel as History,” clearly demonstrates, Mailer did not make any meaningful distinction between fiction and nonfiction. He regarded the novelistic treatment of the Pentagon march (“History as a Novel”) as “a history in the guise or dress or manifest of a novel,” and the reportage counterpart (“The Novel as History”) as “a real or

¹ A similar point is reiterated in various ways throughout literary history. The names of Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault and J. F. Lyotard can be associated with a poststructuralist critique of the Enlightenment philosophy of truth and knowledge. Such a criticism could even be traced back to Nietzsche under his anti-foundationalist stance towards historical knowledge (“What is history but the way in which the spirit of man apprehends *events impenetrable to him*”). While there is no single author to whom the theoretical maxim can be attributed, the theoretical elaboration in a narrativist frame may be credited to Roland Barthes at various points of his writing. For instance: “historical discourse does not follow reality, it only signifies it; it asserts at every moment: *this happened*, but the meaning conveyed is only that someone is making that assertion” (Nietzsche 91; Barthes, “Historical Discourse” 154).

true novel – no less! – presented in the style of a history” (284). Summing up his life-long new-journalistic writing in a sentence, he says that “it’s all fiction,” and further contends that “the historian and the novelist are both engaged in writing fiction,” with the only difference being “that the historian uses more facts, although they can never be numerous enough to enclose the reality” (*The Spooky Art* 154).

While Capote and Mailer have been ambiguous and even inconsistent about the generic nature of their work, playing what Hersey called a “Doppelgänger game,”² E.L. Doctorow blurs the boundaries between fiction and nonfiction most consistently in his practice, and theoretically elaborates it in his aptly titled article, “False Document.” In this manifesto of pan-fictionalism, he observes that history, just like fiction, inevitably involves “a mode of mediating the world for the purpose of introducing meaning” (24). The world on its own has no meaning; meaning is introduced by storytelling it. Storytelling is a fundamental condition for a meaningful world to exist, whether in fiction or history. Quoting Roland Barthes, Doctorow claims that the historical world is essentially a constructed work of “ideology” and

² Hersey criticized Mailer for defining his work both ways at his own convenience. He argued, “One of the conveniences of having a book be both fiction and journalism is that when the journalist’s money-grubbing dirty tricks begin to stink, the novelist can soar away on wings of art, far above it all” (14). That is, news-storytellers’ ambivalence towards their work is often strategic. They can gain the public attention by advertising it as nonfiction, and also avoid the issue of injustice and inaccuracy conveniently by presenting it as a fiction.

“imagination” rather than a transparent outcome of a representable past. The sense of “the real,” which the historical text procures, is purely the effect of its narrative stylistics – what “Teachers of English” call “Realism” (24). From the Mailerian perspective, Doctorow observes, “history is a kind of fiction in which we live and hope to survive, and fiction is a kind of speculative history” (25). Then he echoes the (in)famous dictum: “there is no fiction or nonfiction as we commonly understand the distinction: there is only narrative” (26).

There have been numerous others who shared in this panfictionalism to varying degrees. To name just a distinctive few: Hayden White consistently goes against the grain of historical foundation and assumption, arguing that “as for the notion of a ‘true’ story, this is virtually a contradiction in terms. All stories are fiction” (“Figuring” 27). Lionel Gossman reiterates within the narrativist frame that “[t]he historian’s narrative is constructed not upon reality itself or upon transparent images of it, but on signifiers which the historian’s own action transforms into signs” (32). Roy Schafer also finds this argument equally valid in the field of psychology: “reality is always mediated by narration. Far from being innocently encountered and discovered, it is created in a regulated fashion” (45). Ankersmit’s observation also approximates the poststructuralist conception of historiography: “[f]rom the point of view of its narrative meaning the text is not transparent with regard to

the past but it draws the reader's attention to itself and in doing so obscures from view the past itself" (276).

What Capote, Mailer, Doctorow, and others share with these references to fiction and history is a heightened awareness of and strategic focus on "textuality." The reference can be extended to any narrative text – biographies, travelogues, news-reportage, or testimonies – and, further, to all kinds of texts – films, poems, cartoons, or even radio talk shows. What the aforementioned writers and critics have in common is the argument that the projection of a meaningful world is always a function of the operations of a "text." Text does not relate to reality in the process of meaning-making, but to its own text (and other texts), and therefore, everything that we make sense of can be properly described as being textual. As Marie-Laure Ryan points out, it is "text" – "a single huge category" – that "subsumes every utterance" into a purely linguistic phenomenon, and into a "fiction" ("Postmodernism" 165). As epithetically phrased in Derrida's theorem, "there is nothing outside the text" (158), and repeated in other professions, for instance, in historiography, where "no referent (fact/the past) exists outside the history texts" (Keith Jenkins 20), it is this pan-textuality that ultimately led to what Ryan calls "the doctrine of panfictionality" (165).

This version of textuality is emphatically pronounced and almost standardized in the way Kristeva (along with Bakhtin and Barthes) defined it

as “intertextuality.” While there has been a long history of its practice in literary studies in such terms as allusion, parody, imitation, and Harold Bloom’s “influence,” intertextuality has particularly laced the specifics of postmodern theories. What follows is the oft-quoted definition by Kristeva:

Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least *double*. (her italics 66)

Kristeva’s definition conveniently encapsulates the features of intertextuality by which postmodernist “text” is often characterized. First, text relates to other texts. Text absorbs other texts and is transformed into another, opening up towards a vast web of textuality. This aspect of inter-textuality beyond the immediate context and to infinity is accentuated so much that Barthes regards textuality as a fated condition of “the impossibility of living outside the infinite text” (*The Pleasure of The Text* 36). McHale in the same spirit defines the state of being textual in analogy to “Chinese-box worlds,” referring to its infinitely regressive state (*Postmodernist Fiction* 112). This notion of intertextuality presupposes an unbridgeable gulf between texts and the world and preemptively denies any contact between them. As O’Donnell and Davis accurately observe, intertextuality now refers to “a constant linguistic ‘fact,’ a

representation of language's ever-unfolding filiation with itself, its posited objects, its network of references" (O'Donnell and Davis xiii).

Secondly, Kristeva argues that "[t]he notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity." Text authors text: what questions, answers, influences, and imitates a text are other texts. Under this notion of textuality, particular communicative directions and points are leveled, annulled, and cancelled out. Abandoned is the originality and intentionality of an author to which a text is attributed, as boldly epitomized by such works as "What is an Author?" by Michel Foucault and "The Death of the Author" by Roland Barthes. This notion of textuality certainly weakened the dimension of the author's purposeful use of language to situate meaning, and dehumanized the interpersonal communication into a set of linguistic inter-connections and cross-references. For this reason, Manfred Pfister observes that intertextuality is "the most important tool" to undo the relationship between author and text "to the extent that creativity and productivity are transferred to the text...and the individual subjectivity of the author disappears and his authority over the text vanishes" (212). As Linda Hutcheon acknowledges, intertextuality proves "so useful" in terminating the "author-text relationship."

Thirdly, through these definitions of intertextuality, Kristeva manages to devise what Philippe Carrard labels as "a typology of discourses," under which poetic language is celebrated as the example of dialogic discourse par

excellence, and “historical discourse” as a model category of “monologic discourse...[that does] not enter into a dialogue with other texts” (“Theory of a Practice” 109). Her typology has been endorsed by other literary critics almost by default or at least due to the absence of active contenders. For instance, Sara Mills argues that fictions are “perhaps the most intertextual of all texts, referring to other texts in terms of literary illusion, and in terms of their formal structures” (73). Patricia Waugh also lauds fiction as an exemplary fulcrum of intertextuality: “the language of fiction is *always* to some extent dialogic,” because it assimilates “a variety of discourses (representations of speech, forms of narrative) – discourses that *always* to some extent question and relativize each other’s authority” (5-6).

More explicitly, intertextuality has found unique expression in postmodern fictions that are characterized as ironic, parodic, and paradoxical, or “at least double” in Kristeva’s sense of the term. Hutcheon argues that “historiographic metafiction” foregrounds the intertextual politics of postmodern fictions: “the overt intertextuality of historiographic metafiction serves as one of the textual signals of this postmodern realization” (127). More recently, as Ulrich Broich observes, this intertextuality has become a key term “central to a postmodernist understanding of literature,” intimately associated with “other postmodernist concepts and with some strategies and devices which have been regarded as typically postmodernist” such as “the death of

the author," "the end of mimesis," and "the self-referentiality of literature" (251-252). In Pfister's estimation, intertextuality is "the very trademark of postmodernism," and is "treated as synonymous [with it] these days" (209).

This is not a rejection of the postmodernist position on textuality altogether, nor is it the purpose of this chapter to pursue its theories at length. Rather, I would like to put forth an alternative use of intertexts, practiced over almost every kind of communication but not duly observed, and illustrate the rich potentials and diversities of intertextual activities, which cannot be reified by any dominant language theory. Arguably in some areas of textual production and consumption, our experience of meaning and significance cannot be simply reduced to the text-to-text connection and influence. If the Kristevan and other postmodernist understandings of textuality have flattened the dimension of the storyteller and the world, I will discuss the issue of textuality in the vectors of storyteller and the world, and bring back the active mediator of texts to the discussion.

New-stories are a particularly rich and protean type of discourse for understanding the mode and operation of intertextuality, because a source text a news-story borrows is also drawn upon by other competing news-stories with diverse aspirations, circumstances, and strategies, and is appropriated for the different, and more specific, contexts of those competing stories. News-stories literally embody the intersection and compilation of various source

texts, next to, and on top of other discursive genres such as autobiographical statements, interviews, police synopses, news reports, and academic articles. In this particularly argumentative and competitive discourse, the storytellers actively engage source stories to speculate, situate, and explicate the event, and to argue with them for the world they construct and the meanings they confer. The aim of this chapter is to reframe discussions of news-stories to call for a revised account of intertextuality in respect to the storyteller and the world.

For the clarification of the textual modes of storytellers' engagement with the world, I will classify the textual condition into four major categories – narrative, description, commentary, and speech.³ These four textual forms, I will argue, are not merely linguistically differentiable structures but also cognitively and rhetorically construed activities, through which the storytellers materialize their stance towards the incident they describe and the readers they converse with. Then, through the process of intertextuality in news-stories, I will examine what news-storytellers *do* with texts about the world – instead of what a text *is* or *means* in its relation to the world.

³ What I call “textual forms” are variously called “text types” (Seymour Chatman), “narrative modes” (Helmut Bonheim), or “discourse modes” (Monika Fludernick), with differences in coverage of types of discursive materials and underlying evaluative criteria for taxonomy. Particularly, Helmut Bonheim’s categorization aims for the analysis of a story, and I mainly follow Bonheim’s categorization of textual forms – narrative report, description, commentary, and speech.

2. The Categories of the Text:

Narrative, Description, Commentary, and Speech

News-storytellers rarely exclusively narrate an event. They also observe, discuss, and argue *about* the event with cross-references at various points and levels of their storytelling. With narrative, description, speech, and commentary, they reconfigure the same (or related) event, either as a set of actions and interactions along the experiential continuum, as a describable and knowable happening, as a speech event where the readers directly experience the verbal interactions of characters, or as an instance by which one can elicit a value judgment.

News-storytellers' use of the four textual forms through the textual distinctions and intertextual collaborations is well showcased in the beginning of *The Algiers Motel Incident*.⁴ Initiating the story, Hersey integrates the four textual forms to better represent the various dimensions of the event and provides a range of information that will set up the inceptive configuration and variables for the Algiers motel incident in the first chapter, "Do You Hate the

⁴ To explore the distinctions and relations of the four textual forms, I will mainly resort to *The Algiers Motel Incident* with occasional examples drawn from *The Armies of the Night* and *In Cold Blood*. The reason I give *The Algiers Motel Incident* a major consideration is here random (rather than arbitrary), and is out of necessity for the purpose of this study. While the other two stories have equally valid and distinctive textual and intertextual examples, the purpose of this study—that is, to give an account of how the news-storytellers capture an event in various textual forms, and relate them together to put forth their own arguments—necessitates a focus on one event for a consistent and better illustration of the relationship between the textual forms and the event.

Police?” And then, in the following chapters, he investigates, speculates, and elaborates from various perspectives to answer the question, what happened at the Algiers motel? – the fundamentals of which are not clarified but rather obscured, he believes, by institutional mass-media as well as by the *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. His argument at bottom is that the Afro-American adolescents are not the perpetrators of the incident but the victims: they are erroneously and unjustly condemned as snipers by the law enforcement institutions and personnel.

Through the first section titled “We’ll Be Following You All the Way,” readers of *The Algiers Motel Incident* experience an initial contact with the incident *in medias res*.

The ordeal seemed to be drawing to a close. One of the officers went into room A-4 and told Michael Clark and Roderick Davis to get off the floor and go out in the hall. There were still seven people, five black men and two white girls, spread-eagled against the wall of the hallway. One of the girls had nothing on but her panties; the other was half undressed. The big officer had come in from outside, and he stood behind one of the young men in the line and asked, “Do you hate the police?” “No.” “What have you seen here?” “Nothing.” The police said the blacks should go out the back way and go on home. One of the officers said, “Start

walking in the direction you're going with your hands above your heads. If you look back, we'll kill you, because we'll be following you all the way home." Roderick started out on stockinged feet, and he was sharply surprised when, passing into room A-2 on his way to a back door, he came on the body of Carl Cooper prone in a stain of blood on the carpet... (3)

The narrative starts with the scene of the aftermath of the Algiers motel incident, and moves forward from the perspective of the surviving victims, "Roderick Davis" in particular. Hersey sets the scene, dominated and filtered by Roderick's experience of the passage of time and space: "The ordeal seemed to be drawing to a close." The modality of the verb ("seemed to be" instead of "was") insinuates the uncertainty in the perspective of the surviving victim who is still undergoing the ordeal. Hersey, the narrating author, we can safely assume, knows that Roderick and other friends would be free soon while Carl Cooper, Aubrey Pollard, and Fred Temple (who would be dead by now) would not. Commanded to "get off the floor and go out in the hall," Davis proceeds to the hallway, and briefly witnesses that there were "still" seven others in the hallway. One of the officers from behind warns the victims not to "look back," and Davis, while proceeding according to instructions, was "sharply surprised" when he spotted "the body of Carl Cooper prone in a stain of blood on the carpet" (3). The narrative registers what Roderick experiences

at the perceptual level without any further explanation, so the readers go through the event of the aftermath simultaneously with him. The surprise and embarrassment upon finding “the body” on the carpet are as much ours as Roderick’s when he wonders if “the uniformed men were actually killing people” (3-4).

This segment of the story is put in the mode of narrative, whose characteristics are distinctively “chrono-logic” (Chatman, *Coming to Terms* 9). It forms a sequence of actions pertaining to the “what happened” of the story, syntactically outfitted with action verbs in the past tense. The narrative segment provides the readers with the entrance route into the historical event from the perspective of a character, by making us vicariously experience what he has gone through as perceived and experienced by the participating characters. Why is there “the body” on the carpet stained in blood? What is happening in the Algiers motel? The questions still remain as though behind a veil of mystery.

After offering brief contact with the incident in the mode of narrative (3-5), the story shifts to a different discursive space where readers encounter the voices of the families of the victims in a series of interview testimonies (5-9). In this testimonial space, story-time stops and story-scene fades off, locating the readers outside the story world. Unlike dialogues in the narrative mode (for instance, the dialogues in the preceding excerpt), the testimonies are not part of

the story world of the Algiers motel incident because they do not occur in and during the incident, but they sit right next to it almost like characterial commentary on it to attest to what the family members believe to have happened in the motel. Mr. Gill, the stepfather of the victim Carl Cooper, testifies about the moment when he was stormed by the surviving friends of his son, James Sorter and Lee Forsythe:

Lee got back here about a quarter after three...He didn't ring the bell or anything, him and Sortor just came in, and when he came he fell and crawled and he was crying and he said, 'Miss Margaret, they killed Carl.' That's all he was saying, 'They killed him, they killed Carl.' And I said, 'What did they kill him for?' He said, 'Nothing.' He said, 'I think they killed Auburey, too,' he said, 'they took Auburey in a room and I heard them shoot and Auburey didn't come out.'...When Lee crawled in he was so bloody that he would have scared you. I wondered how he made it. I really did, and when I went to fix his head, I thought maybe I could just wipe the blood off, but the gashes in it was so big I just couldn't. I told him, 'Man, I can't do nothing with this.' Because you could see the *bone*...Sorter couldn't talk...Yeah, Sortor could not talk. He had big knots on his head, almost big as my fist, just all *over* his head. (his italics 6)

The verbal testimonies of what happened in the motel translate into the characters' emotional state of shock, rage, and bewilderment, almost to the condition of unsayable confusion and turmoil, as the characters' testimonies ("Sortor couldn't talk...Yeah, Sortor couldn't talk" and "He didn't know what to say") and Hersey's reporting ("The boys tried to tell them...The two tried to tell") both share the sentiment.

The testimony continues to the next section titled "Auburey Pollard, Jr.," focusing on Mr. Pollard's interview testimony "in explosive and emphatic cadences." The two-page-long testimony highlights Mr. Pollard's relationship to, and fatherly concerns for, his son, "Auburey Pollard." By re-describing the incident in the utterances of the family member, the story transforms and recontextualizes the "body" on the carpet (in Hersey's narration) as a beloved "baby" in the family (9). From his early days to his abrupt death, Mr. Pollard reminisces about his boy, Auburey, who was "a hell of a character," "a good artist," and "a normal American boy," but who "wasn't old enough to find himself." He recalls the worries, doubts, and hopes he had for his son in terms of a father-son relationship (7-8).

What I mean, he was only a baby. I went in the service when I was sixteen years old — lied about my age — and *I* was only a baby. That's the only way I learnt life, that's where I learnt my life. I wouldn't be hard like I am now if I hadn't have been. I

learn the hard way. But the poor little thing, he never knew what hardness was, he had to crawl through a bucket of blood. The poor little fellow, he didn't even know what life was really all about. Auburey was a beautiful kid, but he was just a baby, that'all. Just a baby. (9)

There are good reasons to provide the stories of the victims' family members in direct speech. Their testimonies highlight the sense of loss and grief in a subjective, unfiltered, and unrestrained way. The testimonies invest emotion and feelings into the objective reportage, permitting the readers to have an emotional tie to the victims, and "flesh out" the incident provided in the narrative mode. From this perspective, the form of speech is a particularly apt choice for the description of the characters and their relations to the family because it offers a crucial and necessary "character testimony" without affecting the narrative truth of the story and without harming the credibility of the author as a reporter, who attempts to voice both sides in his story.

In the following section, "A Pleasure-Loving Clientele" (10-11), we come to see the incident from a totally different context of social relations and structures. The story zooms out of subjective and personal experience to a much larger picture of the geographical, economic and ethnic composition of the Algiers motel area and its inner-city dynamics in the mode of description. Hersey observes that "The Algiers Motel was one of many transients' hostelryes

on Woodward Avenue, a rod-straight street, the city's [Detroit's] spine, that divides eastern Detroit from western Detroit" (10). It is located "[a] couple of miles north of the cluster of massive buildings called 'downtown,' and only a few blocks from the section of Twelfth Street where the black uprising of those July days and nights had started." The Algiers area was not only a "transient" place for visitors, boarders, and strangers, located at the dividing center of the city, but also an area of obscure, ambiguous transformation. He continues:

[T]he Algiers stood at the corner of Woodward and Virginia Park, an elm-lined street elegantly brick-paved in the old days but potholed now and patched with asphalt, a street of once prosperous wooden and brick houses with boastful porches and back-yard carriage houses recently declined into rooming houses and fraternity houses and blind pigs, as Detroit calls its illegal after-hours drinking spots. The section had evolved from proper WASP to up-and-coming second- and third-generation immigrant to, recently and more and more, middle-class black" (10).

Then, Hersey relates the Algiers motel to Detroit with a specific orientation relevant to the incident. Detroit is "a vast flat sprawl of houses planlessly intermixed with schools and colleges and great automobile factories and little works and warehouses and stores and public buildings...[with] pockets of

prosperity, of ethnic identity, of miserable poverty, of labor, of seedy entertainment and sometime joy" (10). The Algiers motel, located at the crossing center of the city, is described as having had "a habit of reaching into several of these pockets; its management had changed a few years back, and it was now run by Negroes mainly for a pleasure-loving black clientele." Hersey does not characterize the Algiers motel in any definitive terms, but strongly implies the transient and ambiguous nature of the motel in the transforming or "declin[ing]" sector of the city.

The thick description of the motel, besides its spatial layout, also maps the conceptually disproportionate dimension of the Algiers area. "Facing Woodward," the façade of the motel is pronounced "by a massive sign on two fieldstone posts, with a neonfronded palm tree drooping over a chrome frame enclosing the legend of its Africa-whispering name." "[T]he bold advertisement" then introduces us to "a complex that would have been admirably suited to a Florida beachfront." Next to it stands "originally one of the big bourgeois houses [in] a three-story brick bulk" as an annex, and "[n]orth of the motel on Woodward" borders "Max's 25-Cent Car Wash and a Standard Oil gasoline station" (11). The Algiers area as much as the motel is an obscure district where the illegal practices of after-hours drinking and prostitution smear into the residential area, the esoteric is juxtaposed with the

practical, and the once prosperous images are mixed with the gradually deteriorating environment.

In the following chapters, the Algiers motel area is read and reread across the context and in contrastive terms by both the convicted policemen and the surviving victims as a battlefield for different reasons: where the police see a space teeming with “illicit practice,” the victims find a landscape ridden with “police brutality.” For David Senak, the indicted policeman who specialized in “cleaning up” illegal drinkers and prostitutes, the Algiers motel area represents the basin of crime and immorality, where he fostered an animosity against prostitution (or from Hersey’s perspective, against white girls with black clients) and where he acquired “a sort of bad attitude toward women in general” — or in Hersey’s loaded rephrase in the form of a question, an attitude that “made [him] think of women as essentially evil” (72-76).

Robert Paille, another indicted policeman, shares the same sentiment towards the area and describes it as “the center of crime,” particularly prostitution, that he believes to have “a bearing on these riots” (107, 108).

For Mrs. Omar Gill, mother of Carl Cooper, the area stands for the battlefield where the policemen “pick [a black] up” out of “just suspicion” and “keep him overnight or maybe two days [without] any charge” (15). The Algiers motel area contains and projects two opposing views, those of black neighbors fighting racist police officers and of the policemen subduing black

criminals and revolutionaries; it is where the former loses her sons and friends, and the latter gun-downs snipers. The stories, testimonies, and incidents will be spun out of the dimensions of its spatial characteristics that harbor the potential conflict and its complication as Hersey defines the Algiers motel ("The Algiers Manor House," precisely speaking) as an iconic space "where most of the action of this narrative hid[es] itself" (11).

The underlying logic of the section is to explore the space of the Algiers motel area. In the mode of description, Hersey perceives the Algiers motel and its area as a structure that can be empirically observed, measured, and identified. Predominantly in the mode of "being," the section involved no single action verb as the main verb of a sentence, but mostly copulas that are predicated on the nature and quality of the subject. In other cases, the main verbs are either turned into passive participles ("was announced by" and "was supported by") or used to refer to the continuing state rather than causative action ("stood," "had evolved," "had for years been encroaching," and "had had a habit of reaching"). Hersey describes the Algiers motel as a condition that retains dormant seeds of actions, and that thus may potentially cause conflict.

After the testimonies in speech form and the detailed portrayal of the Algiers motel area in description, the story returns to the aftermath of the incident in the narrative mode in the next section, "It Was Not Safe" (11-14).

The section starts with the scene where it left off earlier in the first section:

“Not long after the task forces drove away from the Algiers, Charles Hendrix, negro owner of the private-guard firm...came to the motel office” (11). Hearing from his employees that there have been shootings, Hendrix “hurried to the manor, and he came on three bodies, one in A-2 and two in A-3, and he felt them and found them still warm” (12). After Hendrix’s initial report to the Wayne County Morgue, policemen, detectives, patrolmen, newspaper people, and others swiftly responded and swarmed the Algiers motel. Here, Hersey introduces the then dominant “sniper” story and its major antagonist story, against which he would compete throughout his storytelling.

The ordeal is now identified and framed within the Detroit riot on Tuesday, July twenty fifth, when various sniping incidents are reported. As the *Detroit News* the next morning makes clear, referring to the scene where “Three unidentified Negro youths were killed in a gunfight” when “sniping began from the Manor,” the sniper story was the master plot through which the media, local government authorities, and law enforcement systems understood the various conflicts and casualties in Detroit (16). While the Algiers motel area is continuously described by law enforcement personnel as the place where the sniping spree takes place – where “shots were coming from the roof and windows on all floors” and the policemen, Guardsmen, and detectives are “pinned down” (16) – the same incident is deliberately cued by

Hersey not to the intensity of sniping, but to the intensity of the officers' perception of it. Hersey depicts the atmosphere of the Algiers motel area, where people reacted in hypertension to no visible threats — or any of the visible things around them:

Everyone was jumpy. When the detectives checked an exit giving out from a dormer in room A-15 on the third floor to the top of a white-railed wooden fire escape...a private guard out on Euclid Avenue, who had seen their dim figures climbing around, apparently on the roof, for all the world like a pair of snipers, gave a new alarm to National Guard Warrant Officer Theodore Thomas, stationed at the Great Lakes Building on the next corner north, and Thomas shouted a challenge. The detectives withdrew. (13)

Hersey highlights the exaggerated feelings of fear and insecurity at the site of a sniper alarm to which even a medical examiner “refused to come” out of fear. He wraps the narrative segment giving an emphasis to the fact that the detectives hurriedly “ordered the manor doors sealed with paper warnings” and evacuated themselves out from the scene to return “at a more safe time” (13).

Now, with authorial commentary, the last textual form to be identified, Hersey concludes the fourth section, “It Was Not Safe,” converging the

segments of his story so far and clarifying his position towards the sniper story. Implicitly subverting its status of being a particular story that has taken place, he marks the competing story by giving it a different generic name—a “theory.” For the first time, readers encounter a slightly insistent and petulant human voice that seeks to engage our understanding of the incident. The voice raises what he believes to be the “crucial issue” of the Algiers motel incident, speculates *for* the readers, and argues the “fatal flaw” in the sniper story proposed by his competitors.

The crucial issue here was how word of the killings reached the authorities. Under cross examination in court, Detective Thayer said that he did not know for a fact that the central communication office of the Police Department had not received a report on the killings from police officers who had been present; but had such a call actually been received, it would have been reported at once, as a matter of iron routine, to Homicide. There is no record of such a call; no one has come forward, in court or out, to say that such a call was received. Indeed, this was the first-noticed and finally fatal flaw in the theory that three snipers had been killed in an open firefight at the Algiers that night: the evident failure of the patrolmen who had been present during the shootings to follow the dictates of prudence, of

humanity, and of standard operating procedure even during the confusion of the riot, by reporting the deaths to headquarters.

(13-14)

An argument, as Chatman points out, “relies on logic.” But “unlike Narrative chrono-logic,” it does not move forward in a temporal sequence, nor does it rely on spatial continuity like description. Instead it resorts to “some intellectually stronger, usually more abstract ground such as that of consequentiality” (10).

In this argumentative space, Hersey clearly establishes himself as an arguer: he offers a proof (Detective Thayer’s testimony) and a counterproof (“There is no record of such a call”), constructs a hypothesis (“had such a call actually received...it would have been reported”), and confronts the readers outside the story world of the past, bringing them to the current deictic center of the “here” and “now” of storytelling (as the present copula and retrospective hypothesis indicate). He argues that he finds no thread of information that substantiates the “three snipers” theory: no such report came from “the patrolmen who had been present during the shootings”; no official record referring to the “three snipers” was available afterwards; and no one tried to bear the story as his own. In other words, the “three snipers” theory is a bogus story or a mere “theory” no one claimed to be his own or wanted to take responsibility for – the point which Hersey considers to be its “fatal flaw”

as a news story, and the reason he ultimately disregards the “theory” as simply an “inflated myth” (287).

So far, I have identified the textually diversified news arena through the four major textual forms. While this textually variant reading of the Algiers motel incident across distinctions of perspectives and orientations of emphases helps us to understand the incident in much fuller and richer contexts, these textual forms are not merely syntactical categories but, more importantly, they serve as cognitive and interpersonal activities through which the news-storytellers negotiate their experience of reality for textual representation. That is, news-storytellers are particularly vigilant as well as cognizant of the need to qualify their stance towards the information they use for the construction of the news-world, and accordingly they construct their roles for, and relations to, the audience, due to the disparity of the certainty, weight, and consistency among the collection of field data.

Viewed in this way, textual representation becomes a highly rhetorical and performative space where the news-storytellers shape their stance towards the reported and construct their role towards the audience with the reporting. In still other words, the news-storytellers rarely deliver the news-events with the same commitment and focus, but explore them with changing frames of reference and interact with the audience with varying postures and nuances, a

dual emphasis from which two major aspects of textuality emerge – the cognitive and interpersonal activities of news-storytelling.

In the following section, I will first illustrate the cognitive dimension of news-stories in which the reporter-writers accommodate a certain aspect of reality to be saliently captured and embodied by a particular textual form. For the illustration, I resort to narrative and description in a contrastive manner, for these two textual forms have the most distinctive history of contrast and comparison across the disciplines such as fiction-writing, historiography, and reportage. And then, I turn to the interpersonal aspect of news-stories in which the storytellers interact with their readers with diversified motivations and goals. In this interactive and dialogic space, the storytellers commit to the news they deliver with different qualifications and varying manifestations, without which the meanings and significance of the news cannot be situated.

3. Textual Forms as Cognitive and Interpersonal Activities

One quotidian experience of giving directions offers the case of how commonly and deeply we are involved in the cognitive practice of negotiating our understanding of the world with textual form. Imagine we are calling for a location of a shop in a city we are visiting for the first time, and are given an answer as follows: “Just keep driving for five stop lights. Then you’ll meet X,

make a left, and keep going until you see a yellow building with a big fish statue. Stay to the right to enter the parking lot. You can't miss it." While the definition of narrative may slightly differ, the language of the direction certainly has the essential quality of narrative in that it perceives the location as a set of sequenced and related actions from the perspective of the driver who experiences reality through the directions.

Or we may receive the direction of the same location in a slightly different way: "We are located at the corner of X and Y, the yellow building with a big fish statue in front of it. Parking and entrance is on the first floor under the building." Description measures the location in their spatial continuity, while narrative forms a temporal progression between the set of actions. Most likely, people would combine narrative and description for locating a place. However, narrative certainly makes it easy to "experience" and "follow" the directions. If the directions get too long or too complicated to follow, descriptive directions would be more effective for mapping out the location. These examples of cognitive mappings show how differently we may acquire, structure, store, and retrieve the attributes of an event through textual forms.

In her study of every day conversation, Deborah Schifffrin differentiates "narrative" from what she calls "list," depending on the ways information is structured: the former builds "temporal structure" in which knowledge is

“inferred largely from the sequential representation of two event clauses in discourse,” whereas the latter has a “descriptive structure” that organizes the information “in ways that focus on entities per se, rather than on what may be predicated about those entities,” and displays “stative predicates” such as “have” and “be” (297, 300). In historiography, Michael Stanford also divides the modes of historical representation into “narrative history,” which is the most familiar form of history writing, and “non-narrative history,” where “description...take[s] over the whole work” (103). Stanford observes that each understands the object of historical knowledge in different cognitive structures; for instance, while human life is like a “multicoloured tapestry,” narrative cuts across “the tapestry of human affairs at speed,” whereas in description, all the “threads [of the tapestry] need to be understood in their own terms” (104).⁵

Beyond the categorical difference, some critics prioritize a certain textual form as more conceptually fundamental and even essential for the explication of the knowledge specific to a certain field. In *S/Z*, Roland Barthes prioritizes “the seme” — “a connotator of persons, places, [and] objects” — as a major

⁵ Stanford lists annalists, Marxist, and other economic, sociological historians as “non-narrative” historians (102-106). One exemplary case would be prosopography, in which historians, according to Lawrence Stone, investigate “the common background characteristics of a group of actors in history by means of a collective study of their lives...[by asking] a set of uniform questions—about birth and death, marriage and family, social origins and inherited economic position, place of residence, education, amount and source of personal wealth, occupation, religion, experience of office, and so on” (107).

cognitive code that determines the range and nature of the story, arguing that “what is proper to [story] is not action but the character as a Proper Name” (190-191). Chatman, for another instance, subordinates narrative understanding to the descriptive dimension in a story. Assigning primary epistemic status to characterial quality, Chatman argues that “[t]he paradigmatic view of character sees the set of traits, metaphorically, as a vertical assemblage intersecting the syntagmatic chain of events that comprise the plot” (*Story and Discourse* 126-127).

The assumption is that the character as the sum of nameable and describable qualities projects attributable and even predictable actions. The actions are understood as a manifestation of the structure of the character trait. For Philippe Hamon, description has a foundational quality in the construction of a story. Description materialized as “the architectural object” is not merely something to be backgrounded with the introduction of a story, but it “already [is] a highly overdetermined semantic object,” intricately related to, and interlocked with, the configuration of the story: it constrains the thematic strategies and regulates the narrative possibilities (26-29).

On the other hand, Vladimir Propp and Algirdas Greimas perceive narrative as more cognitively fundamental. Propp’s “function” and Greimas’s “actant” define a character as “a sphere of action” or as a bearer of a role that performs already designated actions (67; 114). For Gerard Genette, description

is categorically subjected to its master, narrative: it is “naturally *ancilla narrationis*, the ever-necessary, ever-submissive, never-emancipated slave” (*Figures of Literary Discourse* 133-35).

Decades ago, Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren tried to understand the functions of genre through the concept of dominant textual form, arguing that “The class report will always be, by its very nature, a piece of exposition [which they later specify as technical description]. The novel, no matter how much exposition, description, or argument it may contain, will always be primarily an example of narration. Certain instances, it is true, may not be as clear-cut as these. A magazine article on international affairs may seem to be primarily expository, but it may, in the end, aim to convince the reader of the need for a certain policy – and thus, by the main intention, be an argument” (45-46).

While the list of discussions and debates may go on in the fields of history, psychology, legal studies, and other humanities fields, from the early eighteenth century debates between antiquarians and historians to more recent ones between what Jerome Bruner calls “anti-fabulists and fabulists,” what should be noted is that they are primarily arguing for the textual form cognitively appropriate for the depiction of knowledge in the field (11).

While the contrastive evaluations of the two textual forms – one over, or against, the other – may be reductive, my argument is that a textual form needs

to be conceptualized not strictly as linguistically arbitrary but also as experientially and phenomenologically competitive, and intricately related to the direction and point of the representation. What Norman Mailer illustrates with the two different news articles holds good for my argument. Mailer presents two short news stories, one by Jimmy Breslin and the other by Gerald Long from the *National Guardian*. The former is predominantly encapsulated in description and the other in narrative: Breslin's is focused on the explication of the "being" of the demonstrators, while Long's is more geared to the presentation of the "doing" of the demonstrators. The following is Breslin's news article:

Taste and decency had left the scene a long time before. All that remained were these lines of troops and packs of nondescript kids who taunted the soldiers. The kids went to the bathroom on the side of the Pentagon building. They threw a couple of rocks through the first-floor windows. The soldiers faced them silently... There was no humor to it. These were not the kind of kids who were funny. These were the small core of dropouts and drifters and rabble who came to the front of what had started out as a beautiful day, one that would have had meaning to it. They turned a demonstration for peace, these drifters in raggedy clothes, into a sickening, club-swinging mess. At the end of the

day, the only concern anybody could have was for the soldiers who were taking the abuse. On the steps leading from the grass to the blacktop the kids taunted the troops and kicked at them. "Hit them – they won't hit back," somebody yelled. A scraggly bearded guy in a blue denim jacket shrieked. He ran up with a flag holder and swatted a soldier in the back. What it was that this peace march had started out to be, it now became an exercise in clawing at soldiers. And it lasted into the darkness.

(my underline 290)

Breslin's news article is suggestive, evaluative, and deterministic. Centered on the "looks" and "feels" of the demonstrators, the report becomes an integrative assessment of character traits and behaviors. While the report embeds the short segments of narrative and speech as underlined, narrative ("They threw a couple of rocks," "kicked at them," or "swatted a soldier in the back") instantiates the point of the preceding description ("All that remained were these lines of troops and packs of nondescript kids who taunted the soldiers"), and speech ("Hit them – they won't hit back," somebody yelled") also serves to demonstrate the preceding description ("the only concern anybody could have was for the soldiers who were taking the abuse"). That is, narrative and speech are auxiliary to, and illustrative of, description.

Different from Breslin's, Long's report highlights the dynamic change of these two seemingly incompatible and colliding groups, phrased as "the soliders" and "the kids" by Breslin. Long's news article starts with a scene where "[s]ome demonstrators near the entrance and a good number behind the front lines urged the crowd forward" and "[a] company of MPs materialized from the right, running awkwardly like puppets" to confront the demonstrators. The tension escalates as "[the MPs] stopped in front of the ramp, regrouped, leveled their rifles and marched forward" and "[u]nbelieving demonstrators just gaped at them, stunned, confronted for the first time by the guns of 'our boys'" until

...something remarkable happened. People began laughing. Someone threw yellow flowers at the MPs, who by now had stopped, frozen, guns pointed at young men and women their own age. Every time the troops moved forward to push demonstrators away from the ramp, scores, hundreds of youths would sneak behind them – up the ramp.... Each time the action stopped in a particular spot, demonstrators sought to speak with the soldiers, who were under orders not to respond. "Why are you doing this?" a demonstrator asked. "Join us" the soldiers were asked.... A girl confronted a soldier, "Why, why, why?" she asked. "We're just like you. You're like us. It's them," she said

pointing to the Pentagon. She brought her two fingers to her mouth, kissed them and touched the soldier's lips. Four soldiers grabbed her and dragged her away, under arrest. The soldier she had spoken to tried to tell them that she hadn't hurt him. (291-292)

All textual elements of the news article gravitate towards influence, change, and mobilization among the demonstrators and the soldiers. By constantly attempting to converse with the soldiers who were "ordered not to respond," the demonstrators transform the event from physical confrontation to symbolic reconciliation (respectively symbolized by "guns" and "flowers"). When compared with Breslin's insinuating and diagnostic reportage that measures and characterizes the demonstrators and the demonstration with enduring state ("it lasted into the darkness"), the emphasis of Long's reportage lies in the very moment of dramatic change ("something remarkable happened").

By effectively negotiating the textual forms with the experiences they had, Breslin and Long configure the demonstration with differing focus and atmosphere: Breslin's story, being predominantly descriptive, is latched onto the "being" of the event, to its lasting quality, while Long's representation is directed to "doing," heavily embedded in the narrative mode.

Although the target of the entextualization may not be necessarily exclusive to any one textual form but in fact open to different textual forms at

the same time with varying emphases and interpretations, different textual forms nevertheless answer to different aspects of an issue, and operate under their own discursive logics and limitations. The display of landscape may best be delivered by description, and courtroom interaction may be most adequately grasped through speech delivery. Most of sports broadcasting – say, a boxing match – dominantly resorts to narrative, and who’s doing what to whom seems crucial for the purpose of the event. For instance, Marie-Laure Ryan argues that in baseball broadcasting, the primary goal of reporting is to show the happenings on the field, and consequently narrative becomes an essential textual form: it reports “the What “ of the action, and “not the HOW nor the WHY of the action.” There are other components of textual forms, but they do not rise to the level of dominant textual activity. The “gossip, reminiscence of seasons past, or didactic expositions of the finer points of baseball strategy” are often perceived as posing a potential “danger of digressions [sic]” when action resumes, and description is often regarded as possibly conflictual because “[i]ncreasing the level of detail in the description would put language behind in its race to keep up with the present” (“Narrative in Real Time” 143).

What should be noted in *The Algiers Motel Incident*, then, is that the textual variation is a collaborated attempt to articulate different dimensions of the incident in appropriate textual forms and to empower their discursive

distinctions for a richer configuration of the reality. The macro-scale description of the location of the Algiers motel and its area in relation to Detroit is particularly relevant, because the Algiers motel incident is not taken as a happenstance of an accidental confrontation that led to the murder of the African Americans but is subtly implicated as an inevitable corollary of the much deeper and more structural issue of the disproportionate racial compositions and regulations of the Algiers area. The Algiers motel incident is conceptualized as an anecdotal instance of a social structure of racial disparity and discrimination in America at the time, or as Hersey says, “[t]his episode contained all the mythic themes of racial strife in the United States” (25). These textual forms are not merely categorical and imperative, but relevant to the aspect Hersey wants to highlight: description has an influential bearing on the perception of social reality and the contingency of the situation.

Throughout the story, Hersey never enacts the scene of a mystery (the murder of Cooper, Pollard, and Temple) in the narrative mode – that is, in his own voice – but instead presents it in speech (interview and courtroom testimonies), mostly in part five, “The Algiers Motel Incident” (189-241). Though fully convinced that the policemen killed the three innocent adolescents, Hersey does not construct it as a fully-fledged and dramatized event in the narrative mode. Ultimately, his conviction still remains a subjective speculation. Like Hersey, Capote does not represent the manner of

killing (the nature of which is left unknown to anybody else except the two disagreeing murderers), does not commit to a specific narrative representation, and leaves the murder scene blank in the chronology of his story. In the first chapter, the readers see the imminent fate of the Clutters when the two criminals approach the Clutters' house at night ("Dick doused the headlights, slowed down, and stopped until his eyes were adjusted to the moon-illuminated night. Presently, the car crept forward") and then it fades off to the next scene where another Nancy, a friend of Nancy Clutter, visits the Clutters in the next morning, and finds "no response" at "the door [that] was partly open" (72-73). The crucial moment of the murder which will explain the mentality and the insanity issue for Smith will be conveyed by this very person through a confessional speech. There are constant intersections and negotiations between textuality and reality, the reporting and the reported, and the tellable and the knowable.

The issue of textual empowerments, restraints, and burdens leads to, and is closely interwoven with, the second issue. The news-storytellers do not only reframe the target of reporting in terms of textual variation but by so doing, they also reshape their relation to readers in terms of the mode of information delivery. That is, the news-storytellers take up various roles ranging from active participant, speculative mediator, critical and intrusive commentator, to neutral transmitter of knowledge. The conscious change of the

communicative roles or reportorial personae can be attributed to the varied qualities of news information and the different strategies in using news data, which the news-storytellers are ultimately responsible for working with.

The murder eclipsed in the narrative construction is later recounted by the very perpetrator, Perry Smith, who always wanted to prove his masculinity to Richard Hickock and expose his partner's cowardice. The following confessional speech of Perry represents the moment of mystery where in the scene, Perry is bluffing Dick with his angst-ridden grudge:

I didn't want to harm the man [Mr. Clutter]. I thought he was a very nice gentleman. Soft-spoken. I thought so right up to the moment I cut his throat... I said, 'Well, Dick. Any qualms?' He didn't answer me. I said, 'Leave them alive, and this won't be any small rap. Ten years the very least.' He still didn't say anything. He was holding the knife. I asked him for it, and he gave it to me, and I said, 'All right, Dick. Here goes.' But I didn't mean it. I meant to call his bluff, make him argue me out of it, make him admit he was a phony and a coward. See, it was something between me and Dick. I knelt down beside Mr. Clutter, and the pain of kneeling – I thought of that goddam dollar. Silver dollar. The shame. Disgust. And they'd told me never to come back to Kansas. But I didn't realize what I'd done till I heard the sound.

Like somebody drowning. Screaming under water. I handed the knife to Dick. I said, 'Finish him. You'll feel better.' Dick tried — or pretended to. (my underline 275-276)

Capote's compilation of the testimonies, official reports, and private marginalia is all vectored towards the mental state of Perry and the insanity issue, which might have saved him from the gallows under different legal regulations, but more importantly, towards the understanding of Perry as a mentally troubled human being. Capote had been sympathetic to Perry, and he clearly tried his utmost to exculpate Perry through the insanity plea. Perry's language is highlighted by Capote in a way that reflects Perry's mentality at the very moment of the murder. Perry's thought in broken syntaxes and out of context in which he is situated ("Silver dollar. The shame. Disgust. And *they'd* told me never to come back to Kansas") strongly suggests brain explosion and involuntary motor reaction. The moment is dominated by the shrapnel of past memories of anger and discomfort, until he suddenly hears the sound of "somebody drowning" and "realizes what [he]'d done."

Capote as a reporter barely makes a comment on the confession in his own terms, but registers it with shielding quotation marks. Grammatically, the reporting clauses of the confession scene are presented in present tense ("Duntz says," "Perry scowls," and "Duntz asks Smith"), and the readers are brought back to the very moment and spot where the confession as a "speech

event” takes place. Each utterance is quoted and temporal “immediacy” is linguistically effected. It is the textual space where readers can understand the characters in the way they say and even compete with the reporter equally in interpreting the characters’ speech. In fact, in the stories where the unreliable narrator or unreliable character-reflector dominates, speech becomes the most reliable textual place for the readers to concentrate on, evaluate, and judge the design of the story.⁶

In other words, by rendering the utterance of the characters in direct speech, the narrator forsakes his role of author of the utterance and supporter for the value position of the utterance. By guarding it with quotation marks, he proclaims that he neither authors the utterance nor supports it; he merely quotes it for the readers. This reportorial posture he takes towards Perry’s testimony is confirmed by the fact that Capote provides not only Smith’s version of the murder of the family but also the competing version of Dick’s father, where “Dick wasn’t even in the same room” (291).

At other times, Capote mediates, if surreptitiously, for the readers through his language and interpretation, performing a role more than that of

⁶ Wayne Booth points out the use of speech in unreliable narration. For example, he argues that in *Emma* Knightly’s speech becomes the authorial message: “It is hardly surprising that Jane Austen has provided many correctives to insure our placing her [Emma’s] errors with precision. The chief corrective is Knightley. His commentary [in the form of speech] on Emma’s errors is a natural expression of his love; he can tell the reader and Emma at the same time precisely how she is mistaken” (*The Rhetoric of Fiction* 253).

just a reporter. That is, he does not merely quote Perry's (inner-) speech, leaving the readers unattended, nor does he engage the readers in a face-to-face interaction, directly speaking to them. This time, he proffers an epistemologically privileged position to the readers, guiding them through the thoughts of the character. In the following scene, Perry quarrels with Dick over the idea that they need "a pair of black stockings" for the robbery, and Perry finally manages to send reluctant Dick on an errand into a Catholic hospital to get them. Readers get access to a deeper layer of Perry's motives and psychology.

This rather unorthodox method of obtaining [a pair of black stockings] had been Perry's inspiration; nuns, he had argued, were certain to have a supply. The notion presented one drawback, of course: nuns, and anything pertaining to them, were bad luck, and Perry was most respectful of his superstitions. (Some others were the number 15, red hair, white flowers, priests crossing a road, snakes appearing in a dream.) Still, it couldn't be helped. The compulsively superstitious person is also very often a serious believer in fate; that was the case with Perry. He was here, and embarked on the present errand, not because he wished to be but because fate had arranged the matter; he could *prove* it.... (55)

Syntactically, the perspectives are authorial in that the incident is described using third person pronouns and the past tense ("Perry," "he," "presented," or "was"), but the messages and emotions ("unorthodox," "drawback," "of course"), for instance, heavily reflect Perry Smith's original speech, and pertain to the thought of the character. The language presented to readers is actually a combination of the reportorial and the authorial in that it captures faithfully what the character speaks (or thinks) from the perspective of the author.

Particularly, the last sentence ("He was here, and embarked on the present errand, not because he wished to be but because fate had arranged the matter; he could *prove* it") may be literally attributed to Perry, whose original conviction may be traced to: "I am here, and embarked on the present errand, not because I wish to be but because fate has arranged the matter; I can *prove* it." This kind of speech representation, in which the author's voice infiltrates into the character's voice, has often been labeled as free indirect speech and is called by Bakhtin the "character's quasi-direct discourse." Syntactically, "it is authorial speech, but its entire emotional structure belongs to [the character]" (*The Dialogic Imagination* 319).⁷

⁷ Some equivalents are found in Mailer's *The Armies of the Night*. Mailer the character complains that de Grazia started the evening event for protest against the war without him because he was late: "In what sort of mumbo-jumbo of promise and betrayal did de Grazia live? How could de Grazia ever suppose he would not show up? He had spent his life showing up at the most boring and onerous places" (49). This is the thought of Mailer the character from the perspective of Mailer the narrator, which often yields a comic effect. When spotting an Afro-American holding a placard that reads "NO VIETNAMESE EVER CALLED ME A NIGGER," Mailer the narrator describes what Mailer the character

Here, the readers are not given the (inner-) speech passively in quotation marks but are implicitly assisted by the author and provided with the privileged status of looking into the consciousness of the character. In other words, the readers are aligned to be complicitous with the author. We, with the author, do not believe in Perry's delusional "fate." We know that nothing can be further from the truth than Perry's belief that "fate had arranged the matter [and that] he could *prove* it." The irony is purported by the author from the discrepancy between what the character believes and what is insinuated. For this reason, Bakhtin observes that in the double-voiced construction, "the author's voice...may introduce into the transmitted speech a second accent of its own" (319-320). Epistemologically, the double-voice is also the result of the author's mediation, because the reported inner speech that Perry thought in the described way at the moment is still, ultimately, only the author's speculation.

This type of subtle mediation stands in contrast to the case where the author emerges as an avid, active arguer, who confronts the readers either as a supporter, or opponent of the information he delivers. After informing the

thought at the time: "Was a mad genius buried in every Negro? How fantastic they were at their best—how dim at their worst" (134). In the following case, Mailer the narrator describes what the character Mailer thought. The exclamations explicitly signal the response of Mailer the character: "Ah, yes, thought Mailer, as the shopping street flickered past the bus window at a rate not faster than a good horse's trot, yes, bless Fitzgerald for his clear line—and why that long dark night, yes, why, when all was said? and Wolfe dead too early and Hemingway a suicide—how much guilt lay on the back of a good writer—it grew worse and worse" (178).

readers about the nature of the schizophrenic personality by quoting the academic article, "Murder Without Apparent Motive – A Study in Personality Disorganization," Capote refers the readers to the expert's argument, throws a series of speculative questions, and answers the questions he rhetorically posed for the readers. The readers, being the recipients of the questions and argument, face the author in a direct communicative frame:

[I]t is Dr. Satten's contention that only the first murder matters psychologically, and that when Smith attacked Mr. Clutter he was under a mental eclipse, deep inside a schizophrenic darkness, for it was not entirely a flesh-and-blood man he 'suddenly discovered' himself destroying, but 'a key figure in some past traumatic configuration': his father? the orphanage nuns who had derided and beaten him? the hated Army sergeant? the parole officer who had ordered him to 'stay out of Kansas'? One of them, or all of them. (338-339)

In previous quotes, if Capote posed himself towards the readers as a neutral transmitter of the information, covering the perspectives of both sides, or filtered the character's voice from his perspective, still suppressing his presence, in this argumentative space, Capote brings us to the public domain of discourse on the human psyche, and clarifies his point in full voice. His

argument is coterminous with “Dr. Satten’s contention,” and clearly in this argumentative space, we are told to, rather than told for.

Erving Goffman explains the shifting roles of the speaker, employing the term “footing,” by which he means “the alignment we take up to ourselves and to the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production and reception of an utterance” (128). Highlighting the varying stances or the multiplicity of the roles the author assumes towards his audience, he points out the insufficiency of the dyadic model of the speaker/hearer that is not salient for the explanation of the shifting relationship in conversation. He differentiates the speaker’s role – animator, author, and principal – depending on his position relative to the utterance.⁸ Following Goffman, Stephen Levinson also argues for decomposing “the concepts of speaker and addressee into their underlying component concepts – allowing them to be recombined into other, related but more specialized participant roles” (164).

While this concept of “footing” is developed and analyzed in the context of spoken discourse and social interaction, it also pertains to the dynamics of an author’s relations to his readers and participating status to the information (or the extent to which the author endorses and commits to the information he

⁸ The animator for Goffman is like a spokesperson who actually utters the words and beliefs of others and may or may not support what he utters; the author is the one who actually phrases (or rephrases using different words) the expression; the principal is the one who establishes his values by the words. Most commercial actors may be functioning as animators if they are not necessarily believing in what they argue for the audience.

uses). As the author transmits, mediates, and argues for information, shifting one's role in regards to the accuracy and sincerity of the information, so the mode of the readers' reception of information is redefined and refigured: the readers are either informed, guided, persuaded, or collaborated with.

In the second book of *The Armies of the Night*, which is a historiographical representation of the Pentagon march, Norman Mailer verbally articulates such changing orientations and realignments in credibility towards the information. The following passage describes the negotiation for the strategies and processes of demonstration between Dellinger representing "his moderate peace groups" and Van Cleve working for "the interest of the government":

Van Cleve's position became simple. He had to look for every nuance of negotiation which would reduce the potential for violence of the demonstrators. So the choice of road and time of day and rally areas became critical.... So subtle engagements were fought by Van Cleve to restrict any entrance to the Mall until four p.m. Perhaps he knew the buses would be going back to New York at five, perhaps — this is sheer speculation — perhaps charter bus operators in New York were given the idea an early departure from Washington was desirable. (268)

Composing the picture of the demonstration and drawing on various stories, Mailer constantly refers to the ways and degrees he qualifies the information with such clauses and sentences as “It seems obvious that the idea for such a massive rally probably derived from...” (247), “It is possible he [Dellinger] would have been even more militant...” (259), “We must speculate again” (271), to “It is safe to say that the beginning of this confrontation has not been...” (285).

In the novelistic counterpart of the march, this participatory status in regard to information is performed in unique ways. The following scene of Mailer’s arrest displays how readers encounter different authorial stances towards themselves in the delivery of information. “Mailer,” the character and protagonist of the story, is thrilled and high-strung at what he believes to be his historical and symbolic act of defiance against Vietnam War. We experience the shifts of the authorial voice and his attitude towards the readers in disseminating the news. As conveniently marked with round brackets, the shifts move from a dramatized scene where the experience of the character “Mailer” is presented to us, to another space of commentary where the author Mailer addresses the audience more directly with his evaluation of the scene:

But his voice, to his surprise, was calmer than himself – for once it came out about the way he wanted it to, quiet and even. “I was arrested for transgressing a police line.” (“Of course, he was

misquoted,” said Mailer’s sister later. “He wouldn’t use a word like transgress.” She did not anticipate the solemnity men bring to these matters.) “I am guilty,” Mailer went on. “It was done as an act of protest to the war in Vietnam.” “Are you hurt in any way?” asked the reporter. “No. The arrest was correct.” He felt as if he were being confirmed. (After twenty years of radical opinions, he was finally under arrest for a real cause.) Mailer always supposed he had felt important and unimportant in about as many ways as a man could feel; now he felt important in a new way. He felt his own age, forty-four, felt it as if he were finally one age, not seven, felt as if he were a solid embodiment of bone, muscle, flesh, and vested substance, rather than the will, hear, mind, and sentiment to be a man, as if he had arrived, as if this picayune arrest had been his Rubicon... (Of course, he did not know that one of the first two reports to go out would have him saying: “I am guilty, I transgressed a police line,” so that some of the follow-up stories would have him arrested by accident. But for that matter, he had been inaccurate himself – it was a Military Police line he had crossed.) (157)

The voice in the bracket explains, explicates, and interprets for the readers in explicit terms and the readers are collaborated with in accessing the moment,

while the voice in the scene tries to be more faithful to the experience of the character “Mailer” at the moment of the event, and the readers remain with the character’s level in experience. In other words, in the bracketed space, the author and the readers form a more complicitous relationship in sharing the information unknown to the character (for instance, “some of the follow-up stories would have him arrested by accident. But for that matter, he had been inaccurate himself”). In the areas outside the brackets, as the continued “as if” demonstrates, it mirrors how Mailer felt in the moment of excitement, inspiration, and fulfillment in a dramatized scene.

Throughout *The Armies of the Night*, we constantly experience shifts of the narratorial voice that distance and narrow the relationship between the narrating Mailer and the acting Mailer, and between the readers and the character Mailer. The change of footings we find in Mailer’s distinctively “novelistic” story is not, however, limited to any specific types of new stories, but can also be observed in a more traditionally “reportorial” news-story like *The Algiers Motel Incident*.⁹

⁹ For instance, Hersey’s highly referential and reportorial narrative is followed by a commentary where Hersey directly engages his judgment:

The officers [Olshove, Roy St. Onge, and William Bolgar], seeing two men looting inside the A&P, shouted to them through the broken window a command to come out, and they did – Danny Royster, a twenty-year-old, and Charles Latimer, nineteen. According to the police report, the patrolmen ordered the looters against a wall; Latimer obeyed and Olshove handcuffed him; Royster hesitated, and Bolgar and St. Onge, who had a twelve-gauge shotgun in his hands, shoved him.... St. Onge said Royster tried to grab the gun and it went off. The shot killed Olshove. (Royster and Latimer were later both charged with first-degree murder,

The narrations of the three news-stories fluctuate in voice and perspective: their language becomes either “authorial,” so as to prioritize their evaluative voice over others, or sometimes “figural,” foregrounding the voice and emotion of the character. The change of their roles may be marked explicitly, as the examples from *The Armies of the Night* illustrate, or may be inferred from the textual constructions in a syntactically nuanced and implied way as in *In Cold Blood*. Whereas the manifestations of the relationship between the author and his readers may vary, this interpersonal dynamics is embedded in any communicative activity at various points and levels of text such as the verb modalities (“it is,” “it seems”), the modifiers (“very likely,” “as a matter of fact”), appellations (“you,” “my readers”), metanarratives (“I am so sure about this”), and so on.

This dynamic position that the author takes up towards the readers has been obscured by dyadic (author and reader) communication models and the pronoun oriented taxonomies of first, second, and third person narratives.

even though the latter was handcuffed at the time of Olshove’s death. As of this writing, the men were still being held untried in Wayne County Jail.)... (110)

For another instance, speech is interrupted by a commentary. In the form of direct speech, Trooper Fonger testifies that policemen could not have killed one of the victims, Cooper, because when the policemen arrived the scene, his blood was already coagulated.

The blood, it was enlarged.... It was either lung tissue or body tissue and blood, or else it was coagulated blood.... I couldn’t say how fast it takes blood to coagulate, but it had to sit there some time.... As far as turning the man over to see if he was still bleeding, we did not do this. Somebody felt for his pulse and couldn’t find one.... There was also a spent red shotgun shell laying on the floor. This would be to the victim’s feet or who was supposed to be the victim.” (I cannot help commenting that racism tiptoes its guilty way through quiet phrases like that last one.) “His head was facing a door. We opened this door and ...” (212)

What is lacking in this static conceptualization of textual forms is the varying and wide spectrum of storytelling activities. The news-storyteller shapes, adjusts, affirms, and changes his relationship to the readers with varying nuances, affiliation, and orientation: sometimes, we are told to, other times, we are told for; we are often actively mediated by the storyteller to experience the incident in fuller contexts, or we remain in confusion with the characters, unprepared for the upcoming event; at some points we are alerted to the change of the authorial stance in explicit terms, at others, we are left unassisted.

In the news-stories, this interpersonal dimension is manifested particularly through the mode of information delivery: the ways in which and the assumption under which information is handled – transmitted or interpreted, hinted or expressed, argued or resisted. The degree and manner in which the author participates in the delivery of historical information decides the direction and force of communicative transactions (affirmed, speculated, ironized, or refuted). This interpersonal aspect of textual forms redefines our doing with intertext from the linguistic and textual interconnections to communicative engagement and provides a more richly textured view of language use and social discourse.

4. Intertextuality

Now, let me return to the Algiers motel incident to explicate Hersey's intertextual practice. Cognitively, "Do You Hate the Police?" (the first chapter which I examined in relation to the four textual forms), serves as a thumbnail sketch of the event which is to be investigated in later chapters through court testimonies, police synopses, medical statements, and news reports. To disqualify the competing story and reinforce his version of the incident, Hersey draws on tangentially related intertexts that may have pertinence to some localized issues — where the particular intertextual logic of *The Algiers Motel Incident* emerges.

The Algiers motel incident is an event where the legally binding material and circumstantial evidence were not sufficient, and witnesses for both the plaintiff and the defendants were not readily available either out of fear or complicity. Even a chronology crucial for the construction of a story was unattainable both for Hersey ("Doubts about chronology could only be revealed, not resolved" and "I am not certain of the order in line") and the participating characters ("chronology was always a pesky jumble to Thomas" and "there was some fishiness about the chronologies offered by Thomas and the troopers") (27, 217; 223, 255). Despite the apparent lack of direct evidence, Hersey struggles to make sense of the incident, and in the course of his story-

making effort, intertextuality gains increasing prominence as he strives to appropriate, combine, and control other stories to bear out the assumptions and arguments of his story.

One of the most illustrative cases is the sniper story, to which Hersey makes repeated visits with loads of background information and relevant resources. As mentioned earlier, when initially identifying the Algiers motel incident within the Detroit riot in the section of "It Was Not Safe," Hersey even refused to grant the empirical label to sniping in the Algiers motel, as officers claimed and other media followed, by dismissing the claim as a mere "theory." Instead, he strategically framed the incident in a way that highlighted the intensity of the officers' perception of sniping. In the episode, "[e]veryone" is described as feeling insecure and suspicious, and the "National Guard Warrant Officer Theodore Thomas" misidentifies the detective Thayer who was absorbed in "a preliminary search" as a sniper and "shouted a challenge" (13).

In chapter ten, "An Alarm of Snipers," Hersey returns to the "insane night" when the frenzied sense of fear and insecurity among law-enforcement officers overrode their rational appreciation of the situation. To illustrate the issue of law-enforcement officers' excess sensitivity and consequent overreaction, Hersey juxtaposes the two stories where "Tonia Blanding, a four-year-old black child...was killed by a burst from a tank's .50-caliber machine gun when someone in the room with her lit a cigarette and the flaring match

was taken for the flash at the mouth of a sniper's weapon," and "Helen Hall, a fifty-year-old white woman...was killed as she stood at a fourth-floor window of the Harlan House Motel, just after she had called to other motel guests to come and watch a tank in the street and had yanked the curtain back to give them a better view" (137).

While the two stories are certainly suggestive of how madness crept in when the officers' stirred emotions exaggerated their perceptions, these discrete episodes do not explicate why the same overreaction should have occurred in the Algiers motel incident, but simply bear indirectly on Hersey's assertion of the possibility. In other words, it provides an epistemological window through which we frame the incident, but, nevertheless, it cannot decide the ontological status of "what really happened" or what really led to the death of the three adolescents. The events can be relevant for the explanation of the general circumstances under which the officers responded, but the analogy stops there. Each story constitutes a substantially disparate event. Potentially, the same episodes are compatible with different plots and may work in a possibly contradictory context.

For instance, while the incident of "Helen Hall" is embedded in Hersey's argument to illustrate the officers' hysterical reactions and tragic consequences, it may potentially become a site of subversion and resistance to Hersey's claim because the same incident exists in different forms with

variance in goals, angles and details. Van Gordon Sauter and Burleigh Hines' *Nightmare in Detroit*, published in 1968, the same year of Hersey's publication, argues that the story of "Helen Hall" is much complicated in plot and number of characters and does not attempt to resolve the case. The direct cause of Hall's death is speculated about at best.¹⁰ Though her death is implied – if not stated explicitly – to be a consequence of the response of military force (very likely the "tank" she pointed at) to the sudden flash when she "yanked" the curtain open, this implication is somewhat more manipulated through personal conviction than is factually warranted. In any case, ambiguities remain unresolved and potentially disruptive.

Intertexts may be described as carrying distracting and alienating layers of significance that may possibly lead to the dissociation and the reconstitution of the stories that use them, and we may characterize this aspect of intertextual practice as being potentially heterogeneous and subversive. Here, intertextuality is conceptualized differently from Kristeva's definition: the Kristevan manifesto defines an intertext as an intention free zone in which communicative collaborations and intersubjective contentions are annulled and cancelled out and languages play themselves out, whereas Hersey's

¹⁰ The readers are provided with several possible answers: "Police believe that a sniper was responsible for Mrs. Hall's death"; mayor Cavanagh and Henry Heading, Chief of the Criminal Division believe that a guardsman fired "the fatal bullet" or "the bullet that killed Mrs. Hall"; and the husband of Mrs. Hall' daughter believes that "there is [not] enough evidence one way or another" (172).

intertextual practice certainly retains the interpersonal tension that may be attributed to the double-sided nature of its direction and use: the desires and designs of two different authors and the ideological worlds they enact. Consequently, its manifestation cannot be generalized in one way or another — ambiguating or clarifying for instance — but varies due to the unique qualities of a speech event, and largely depends on the specifics of intertextual relations and the order of discourses.

This particular force of intertext is implicated in Bakhtin's "heteroglossia" ("*another's speech in another's language*") where "two speakers" and "simultaneously two different intentions" coexist with varying articulations from writer to writer and from genre to genre (*The Dialogic Imagination* 324). V.N. Volosinov characterizes the intertextual force between "the speech being reported" and "the speech doing the reporting" as "the dynamism of the interrelationship," arguing that their dialogue may yield different shapes with different degrees (119-120). Fairclough also points out that whereas "Intertextuality entails an emphasis upon the heterogeneity of texts...Texts also differ in the extent to which their heterogeneous elements are integrated" and explains with two contrasted forms of "direct speech" and "indirect speech" (104-107). Since intertexts verge on more than two different textual worlds or merge them into one large interactive semantic system, their relationship may be better characterized as a dynamic and complex negotiation

between heterogeneous and homogenizing forces, both conflictual and collaborative.

Particularly indicative of these contending but related forces of intertext is the following court interrogation where the defense attorney questions and Theodore Thomas answers about the night of the riot and sniping. Thomas attempts to tell a story that apparently fits the sniper theory, for which Hersey tries to elicit a radically different significance in his storytelling context.

Q. Machinegun fire, you say?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Small-arms fire?

A. Small-arms fire, rifle fire. There was all kinds of shooting.

Q. And this was throughout the evening?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The later it became, the worst it became, right?

A. I'd say yes.

Q. All right, and there is no question whatsoever but what at that point and in that area things were extremely tense?

A. Yes; yes sir....

Q. Tuesday night was one of the worst, wasn't it?

A. Yes, sir, it was the worst for me.

Q. Right, all right, but in this area, on this night, there was a great

fear and apprehension with reference to sniping?

A. Yes, sir, this is when the sniping became its worst. (137-8)

What is interesting about the use of this excerpt is that although Thomas' testimony is clearly focused on his experience that there was "all kinds of shooting" and that on Tuesday night, "the sniping became its worst," Hersey intentionally focalizes on the intensity of his perception: how he felt that "things were extremely tense" and that he had "a great fear and apprehension with reference to sniping." What Hersey tries to argue with this locally empowered interpretation of the transcript is that the night when "the sniping became its worst" was "as things turned out, the night of culmination—a night of hallucination": how "[l]ike a whisper grown too loud in mad imaginings, the word 'sniper' scurried around town and became a kind of roar" (137).

While the grafted text is heterogeneous and subversive in nature, it is locally empowered and recontextualized, offering a context within which to read the Algiers motel incident.

Despite this heteroglossiac foreignness of intertextuality that harbors potential discordance and variance, there also looms a new horizon of textual meaning and significance that may be conceptualized as "intra-textual." Intra-textual engagement situates and stabilizes the intertexts in the refigured discursive world, or to use the wordings of Randolph Runyon, "intratextuality" functions in a way to "account for what can happen when the

texts in a text...begin to refer to each other in ways that seem to refer to their doing so" (9). While intertextuality always retains a possible resistance, it should be also noted that intra-textual practice brings together and integrates the textual patches of different discursive worlds by networking, reworking, and reconstructing them, and signifies a new relation of textual and discursive differences – the intertextual practice in which a new order of meanings and significance emerges and dominates the textual terrain.

A more relevant and explicit case of an intra-textual taming of the intertext to have a literary effect (an ironical effect in the following case) comes with what Bakhtin called a "hybrid construction": "an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two 'languages,' two semantic and axiological belief systems" (304). With this hybrid construction, Bakhtin shows how these extraneous and contradictory utterances, nevertheless, form the meaning, value, and style of their own world when intra-textually orchestrated. What follows epitomizes how heterogeneous language enters into the context of Hersey's storytelling, and is further reproduced differently in force and direction by intra-textual engagement.

In "Snipers: The Myth," another chapter that closely examines the sniper theory, Hersey draws on the articles of "the *Detroit News*" and quotes

the language of a “top law enforcement officer” who perceived sniping in terms of “a Nationwide Plot,” where the “sniping activity is part of the network of the Black Power movement” and systemically divided into “city groups that are called ‘bays’ [that] roughly resemble Communist cells” (287). Hersey continues to observe the many city authorities’ concerns and convictions that relate the incident with the black revolutionaries and extremists. Then, in contradiction to the claims, Hersey juxtaposes the analysis of the *Detroit Free Press*, which reports that out of “The 43 Who Died” in the Detroit riot, “[a]t least six of the forty-three victims were killed by the National Guard,” and “[e]ighteen of the forty-three were killed by Detroit policemen”: they were identified either as innocent victims or riot looters. After identifying “the one and only sniper killed in the uprising,” Hersey uses the competitors’ language to attack their position, and argues that even “[t]his sniper did not fit, by any means, the picture of the dedicated, educated, intellectually sharpened, politically aware, suicidally inclined black revolutionary zealot of the sort those who feared a national plot had been describing” (288-289).

The language of others (“dedicated, educated, intellectually sharpened, politically aware, suicidally inclined black revolutionary zealot”) is recontextualized obliquely and ironically to discredit the competitors’

viewpoint.¹¹ This ironical inflection occurs precisely at the intertextual crossover where Hersey's language engages the competitor's from a different interpretive frame. This intertextual practice re-aligns the readers' position to the author's knowledge and stance, while keeping an emotional and intellectual distance from the competitor's.

While Hersey is fully convinced that "the boys were not executed as snipers" but "executed for being thought to be pimps, for being considered punks, for making out with white girls," he does not encase the core incident in a fully reconstructed event in a narrative mode, but collaborates and supports his version of the incident with varying textual materials that are more salient and contingent on the Algiers motel incident (195). Intertextual space is where contingent social relations and specific interpersonal confrontation emerge rather than dissolve, and where beyond the linguistic cross-references and

¹¹ In chapter five, "Aftermath," for another instance, Hersey quotes the words of Jerome Cavanagh's recommendation "*to forestall the catastrophe*" (275). Hersey immediately juxtaposes and points out the context of the phrase "to forestall the catastrophe" in the ironical context where the Mayor "point[ed] with pride to its 'battle-tested' riot-control plan" (276). "To restore law and order," the Mayor continues to argue, "we must modernize our techniques for dealing with mob action, adopt the latest scientific devices, revamp our plans for dealing with civil disorder by planning for a more effective and fluid governmental response" (277). Hersey in the following passages rephrases the Mayor's assertion into a question as follows: "In what relationship does the need for law and order stand to other pressing needs in our society?" and "What kind of law and order must we have?" Though the Mayor emphasized the phrase ("To restore law and order") to highlight the operational aspect of its enforcement, Hersey re-aligns the same phrase to foreground the foundation upon which the enforcement of "law and order" is based in the context of his own story.

inter-connections, the grated text is affirmed, manipulated, refuted, ironized, and questioned in a newly defined discursive space.

I take this multi-textual enactment and inter-textual engagement as a reflection of the news-storytellers' effort to contain the multidimensional human experience by relating different texts, either confirming, parodying, or refuting their perspectives. By forming bridges, filters, and overlaps among diverse versions of reality, the news-storytellers reach out for other stories for evidences, make their own serve as a context for others, and materialize the event in a larger and more relevant context.

5. The Textuality of News-Stories

News-storytellers construct the story world of personal experience and historical knowledge with an enticing narrative report where the readers vicariously go through an incident, a theatrical stage of surroundings and people that gives a new character and depth to life, and an argumentative arena where the readers are given an account and persuaded about a certain type of knowledge. They locate the readers within a particular discursive perspective towards an event, and constitute a relationship of a kind with the readers and define their roles. By explicitly resorting to the concept of text as an enabling "medium" through which history is given shape and meaning, I

regard textuality as a condition of historical representation that mediates between the readers and the world.

The appropriateness of sign theories to the questions of mediacy to the world may vary depending on the orientations to and assumptions about a text—either as a necessary and indispensable route to the world, a stable source for historical representation, a playground of free-floating signifiers, or more or less a curse of a lost-world and an exile of meaning. To use Hayden White’s terminology, the relation between “language and the world of things” may be taken as iconic (“a representation of [the] world”), indexical (“a manifestation of causal relationships governing the world of things in which it arises”), symbolic (“a symbol of that world, in the mode of an analogue, natural or culture-specific”), or sign-systematic (“a code bearing no necessary, or ‘motivated,’ relation to that which it signifies”) (*The Content of the Form* 124).

Kristevan “intertextuality” opts for the last mode of language as a closed sign system that “bear[s] no necessary, or ‘motivated,’ relation” to the world and further eradicates the “intersubjective” dimension that is inscribed in any social discourse. As Simon Dentith points out, in borrowing the concept of intertextuality from Bakhtin and transforming it into the postmodern aesthetics of text and representation, Kristeva “effectively deracinates the signifying process, tearing it out of the dialogic encounter which is its only imaginable context for Bakhtin” (qtd in Allen 58).

This version of postmodern textuality has been amplified and empowered in various sectors of textual production and consumption. The notion of (inter-) textuality, made all too current by the postmodernist preoccupation, is not, however, without skepticism and opposition, and has come under increasing resistance that tries to unseat its theoretical dominance. Some scholars find the nature and the demand of their work radically at odds with the postmodern conception of textuality. For instance, Jerome McGann observes that there is an abiding difficulty in compromising postmodern textuality with his work, where “the inquiry is grounded in the thought that texts represent...certain kinds of human acts” (4). Even with what he believed to be “so unexceptionable as to stand beyond the need of dispute, perhaps even beyond the need of elaboration,” he feels challenged by “our culture’s now dominant conceptions of textuality” (4).

William Cronon also finds “something profoundly unsatisfying and ultimately self-deluding about an endless postmodernist deconstruction of texts” (1374). In his affirmation of the role of historians and their storytelling of the past, he describes himself as positioned to defend something so fundamental “that [historians] rarely bother even to state it” (1372).

Clearly, postmodernist argument about textuality has breathed much vitality into the discussion of texts, but while doing so, it also unduly universalizes its aesthetics of texts, colonizing other disciplinary domains and

creating a distinctive monologic other to novelistic discourse. The literary theorization of history-writing as frequently opposed to fiction-writing, however, has been considered deductive and speculative by language-oriented theories rather than examined as an instance of language use and discursive practice that is interpersonally situated and socially constituted. Philippe Carrard, pointing out this top-down generalization, argues that literary critics first “posit[ed] the existence of a monolithic ‘history,’ [and] endow[ed] it with all the earmarks of the positivist model” (27). Carrard attributes the theoretical misconception of historiography to “the basis of a limited corpus” on which Bakhtin, Barthes, and Kristeva relied (*Poetics of the New History* 27, 196).

Whether or not it was the lack of coverage of the corpus or the fundamentally misconceived generalization, we now have a clearer picture of the potential and viability of Kristevan and other postmodern theories of textuality after a long period of discussion and debate. I would like to point out the plethora of theoretical observations about postmodern intertextuality and the unbalancing paucity of its actualized practices in historiography. After several decades of argument, announcement, and theorization for postmodern textuality in the profession of history by Hayden White, F.R. Ankersmit, Hans Keller, and Robert Berkhofer, to name a few, there seems to be a distinctive failure to translate the theories into some set of demonstrable practices.

Apparently, the postmodernist critics' bags are full of guides and directions for postmodern textuality and narrativity but without substantial practices or illustrations of such history-writings. To rephrase my argument in Keith Jenkin's puzzled question, "what, after all this theorizing, do (or would) postmodern histories actually look like...?" (28). According to Jenkin, "this reasonable request is difficult to fulfil": if it is a new kind of historiography that may be differentiated from the works of history so far, "they are clearly not yet in existence." Historian Robert Rosenstone also recognizes this wide gap between theories and practice, which he purports to fill in with his work, *Mirror in the Shrine*, pointing to "historical narrative and modes of representation that have been acknowledged by some historians in theory but have yet to touch the way history is conceived or written" (xii).

At this crucial point of this prolonged disparity of several decades, one will barely manage to cite a set of examples of a postmodern type of historiography – for instance, Simon Schama's *Dead Certainties*, Robert Rosenstone's *Mirror in the Shrine*, and Richard Price's *Alibi's World*. Jenkins, citing Berkhofer, recognizes Greg Denning's *Mister Bligh's Bad Language*, Richard Price's *Alibi's World*, and Robert Rosenstone's *Mirror in the Shrine* as "intimations of postmodern-type histories," that are not yet thorough enough to be labeled as postmodern histories. These oft-cited "postmodern" histories, however, cannot be further from what would be characterized as distrusting or

suspecting historical knowledge, the mediacy of language to reality, and their worlds of linguistic construction, or from Hutcheon's version of the postmodern story that simultaneously "inscribe[s] and undermine[s]," "installs and subverts," "establishes and then crosses" its own historical assumption and construction.

For instance, Schama with *Dead Certainties* is, if anything, certain about what may constitute historical knowledge and what may not: in "A Note on Source" he clarifies what has been "purely imagined fiction" and "purely fictitious dialogues," and where he "faithfully followed accounts given in letters and journals" (327). In the same spirit, Rosenstone clearly argues and stands for the historical world of Meiji Japan he constructed. While he tried to "achieve the density, specificity, and ease of temporal movement of a novel," he also did this "without sacrificing the integrity of data on which any work of history must be based" (xiii). Both stories are thickly substantiated by the long list of clarifying and qualifying "sources" and "notes." Both authors validate the worlds they construct with substantial bibliographical citations and clarifications of their narrative methods.

In the first place, it would be hard to find any historian (or any literary scholar of biography for that matter) who would consciously write a story in which he would genuinely question and problematize his historical findings and arguments based on them. More than likely, what seems more relevant

and fruitful for this ongoing discussion of textuality and intertextuality is to specify the underlying forces of intertextuality operating in each discourse, because the meaning and significance of the texts do not reside in abstracted theories but are materialized in particularized uses of stories.

News-storytellers take up various communicative stances towards their readers as arguers, mediators, observers, authors, and transmitters, shifting the directions and forces of the use of the intertexts. They alternate discursive spaces so as to have life stories take on new perspectives with added meaning and significance. What has been exiled from Kristevan textuality is this interpersonally situating and cognitively negotiating dimension where the storytellers engage with other texts to complement, refute and modify them and to speculate, examine, and interpret the features and possibilities of an event in various textual conditions. These storytelling activities virtually amount to an arduous study and investigation of events that defy clear and easy story-making. Intertextual mediation becomes essential to situate meaning and significance rather than to liberate or problematize them.

This particular working of intertextuality is implicitly inscribed in any communicative process, as observed by such critics as Paul Ricoeur and Donald Davidson. This retelling, refiguring, and recontextualizing process of intertextuality is the source of meaningful construction for the world and for the possibility of an inter-semiotic dialogue between language and reality. For

instance, Ricoeur posits a pragmatic “miracle” to overcome the philosophical and linguistic quandary of the “radical non-communicability of the lived experience”: “An event belonging to one stream of consciousness cannot be transferred as such into another stream of consciousness. Yet, nevertheless, something passes from me to you. Something is transferred from one sphere of life to another” and this “miracle” is procedurally labeled as an “interlocutionary act” (14, 16). Whereas “[t]he experience [of an event] as experienced, as lived, remains private...its sense, its meaning, becomes public,” he continues to argue, due to “the intersubjective exchange itself, [to] the happening of dialogue” (16). It is this dialogic practice that makes it possible to “screen, so to speak, the polysemy of our words and to reduce the plurality of possible interpretations, the ambiguity of discourse resulting from the unscreened polysemy of the words” (17).

Davidson also saliently explains this inter-semiotic dialogue with what he refers to as “triangulation”:

It is the result of a threefold interaction, an interaction which is twofold from the point of view of each of the two agents: each is interacting simultaneously with the world and with the other agent. To put this in a slightly different way, each creature learns to correlate the reactions of other creatures with changes or objects in the world to which it also reacts” (128).

For Davidson, this triangulation enables interlocutors to relate, situate and form the meaning and significance of an event. By “triangulating” an event, we negotiate the heterogeneous epistemic perspectives and come to have a more contextualized and situated view of an event. For him, triangulation is a necessary source of reliable knowledge.

Only recently have literary critics begun to raise awareness about alternative conceptualizations of intertextuality. Mary Orr proposes the use of the term “interdiscursivity” as “a rival term for [Kristevan] intertextuality” to embrace “the ideological dimensions of communication principally in its *intersubjective* interlocutory contexts,” and “meanings, or the third term, referentiality, that the binarist, Saussurian, linguistic model (and its related theories) actively rejects” (her italics 42-43). Graham Allen also recognizes and differentiates two distinctive articulations of intertextuality: one that is contextually centripetal and historically constructive, and the other, centrifugal and deconstructive. In short, “To study intertextuality,” he argues, “is to confront questions such as “Is intertextuality an historically informing term, or is it essentially ahistorical?”, “Is the centre of intertextuality in the author, the reader or the text itself?”, and “Does intertextuality aid the practice of interpretation, or resist notions of interpretation?” (59).

We never experience the past as a whole. We can only find snatches, fragments, and traces of it. Since historical knowledge exists in parts, we

collaborate those pieces of the past to form a meaningful story pattern, and also resolve the differences and particulars to render the point of our storytelling. News-storytellers actively engage neighboring stories in multi-textual forms and genres. This mediating act is downplayed in postmodern sign theories that do not involve the interpreting and deciding mind of a storyteller as a factor of signification and cognition.

While Hutcheon prefers to have multiple textual strategies in form or perspective to contradict and subvert historical knowledge with metafiction,¹² it is also true that for other types of storytelling, these varied textual practices recognize the particular contingencies of historical events and their immediate pragmatic context, while not necessarily denying other possibilities, reconfigurations, or redescriptions of the events.

The three news-stories instantiate an intertextual manifestation in which the coexistence of various textual modes and epistemological differences are less the formal expression of a textual aporia, than the condition of historical knowledge. The news-storytellers penetrate, intersect, and saturate the historical event through various textual representations, and by so doing, they reconcile content with form, fact with figura, and social reality with discursive

¹² For one instance, discussing D.M. Thomas' *The White Hotel*, Hutcheon argues that the "multiple and often contradictory forms and points of view (first-person poem, third-person expansion of it in prose, 'Freudian' case history, third-person limited narration, first-person epistolary form used by many characters) call attention to the impossibility of totalizing narrative structures in a more overt way" (166).

representation. Though discrete and fragmentary, these multiple textual versions of reality form a composite relationship as a story, each complementing and supporting one another, and also contradicting and floating, but, nevertheless, approximating to what Bruner calls “a properly pragmatic view of the Real” (23).

CHAPTER IV
TRANSCRIBING REALITY:
A CASE HISTORY OF THE “TRANSCRIPT MODE”

1. The Diachronization of the Text

Text, or a textual form, is the “matter” of a fulfilling medium through which writers configure a specific discursive reality in collaboration with the underlying values, interests, and practices of a given culture. Accordingly, it is also the material instance of the culture through which the readers query, estimate, and experience those cultural foundations and assumptions. While an instance of the textual phenomenon is subject to a synchronic scrutiny and studied in a descriptive and analytical way as a tangible substance that has features and qualities of its own, it is also a historical object that develops and transforms throughout the course of history, intricately bound to the socio-cultural context of the time in which it is produced.

In the previous chapter, I examined the capabilities and implications of these textual forms through the categories of narrative, description, argument, and speech—more or less as “givens” of a textual reality for analytical clarity. In this chapter, I will locate the textual forms in history and examine news-storytellers’ particular doings with them. The textual forms will be considered

as material with which news-storytellers strive to effect a reality of a kind in an effort to articulate their understanding of that reality and to valorize their textual representation. As the material that writers put their hands on and labor with, the textual form may be described metaphorically as living through the fluctuations of literary life—or through the trends and changing emphases of critical thinking—prospering at one period and declining at another, in relation to the domains of writing and to social contexts.

“Dialogue,” for instance, as a textual mode of speech representation was a relatively late innovation in the field of novelistic discourse. It was integrated gradually into novelistic discourse during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and then became, in Lennard Davis’s estimation, “more or less fixed in the 1780s” (356), and as Helmut Bonheim observes, now prospers “at the peak of our present hierarchy of [the four textual] modes” (8). Nowadays, dialogue is an integral part of novels, so much so that Richard Cohen, a contemporary novelist, labeled novels characteristically as “People Going from Room to Room, Talking” (60).

In the same field of novelistic discourse, argument also has a defining contour in the opposite direction. Argument directed at the readers, also known as authorial commentary, was regarded as “an essential part of storytelling,” and storytellers “often felt called upon to pretend to instruct rather than to entertain the reader” at least till the turn of eighteenth century

(Bonheim 9, 32). This kind of authorial intervention, however, as the desirable or necessary ground for relating to readers, has diminished considerably through the nineteenth century up to the point where it is taken to be one of the “great offenses...against narrative art” in the early twentieth century (Joseph Beach, *The Twentieth Century Novel* 18). Authorial commentary on the story world was avoided or kept to a minimum under the realistic aesthetic of the autonomous story world in the early twentieth century. Percy Lubbock codified his preference for the covert and unobtrusive storyteller in *The Craft of Fiction*, and argued for “a very ‘impersonal’ writer, one who keeps in the background and desires us to remain unaware of his presence[,] places the story before us and suppresses any comment of his own...embodying [his feelings] in living form, instead of stating them directly” (67-68).

The large-scale contours of the historical receptions and developments of textual forms, when scrutinized more closely, contain more context-specific and genre-relative trajectories and articulations.¹³ The various ways in which a

¹³ According to Dwight Atkinson’s study on the corpus of scientific articles from *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* from 1675 to 1975, while scientific discourse during the periods generally pursued “‘timeless’ descriptions,” it still retained “substantial amounts of narrative.” It was towards the twentieth century when it became “progressively more ‘non-narrative’ over time, until it approach[ed] extreme ‘non-narrativity’ in the modern period” (“Integrating Multiple Analysis” 154). Henry Bauer describes scientific discourse in a broader spectrum between hard science and soft science, and places it in a metaphorical continuum between “map-like” knowledge and “story-like” knowledge, moving from physics, chemistry, to geology and then to biology (269). For another instance, while history is a distinctively storytelling discipline, there were certain groups and schools that resisted telling a story. What Eric Hobsbawm calls “new historians” in the early twentieth century pursued “the socio-economic base and

textual form is empowered, suppressed, variegated, and particularized, are the critical bases on which we can measure its manifestations and relations with regard to human agency and historical contingency.

Speech in the form of a transcript, which is the focus of the present chapter, is particularly illustrative of the historical and cultural implications and significance of textual form in news-stories. Though the historicity of the textual forms, especially narrative and description, has been well researched by such critics as Cynthia Wall, D.R. Woolf, Robert Mayer and Lincoln Faller, little attention has been paid to speech and virtually none to its lesser known variant in the form of a transcript – what I will refer to as the “transcript mode”¹⁴:

Q. Did you say that he was going to be run over by a car?

A. I said he’s going to be run over by a car.

Q. Who were you referring to?

A. James Sortor. I was talking to him.... Me and James, he was – we was just talking. He was by the curb and I just happened to say it at the time he came by....

(The Algiers Motel Incident 309-308)

determinants of history, at the expense of – sometimes, as in the French battle against the ‘history of events,’ in direct confrontation with – traditional narrative history” (301). They were more interested in the “why” than “what” of history (Eric Hobsbawm, “The Revival of Narrative: Some Comments” 299-304).

¹⁴ Lennard Davis referred to the transcript mode as “conversation” in his article, “Conversation and Dialogue,” from which I greatly benefited. I will use the term “transcript” to include other non-conversational speech transcriptions and also for its cognitive convenience.

The “transcript mode” is a variant of speech representation in which the speech event is (assumed to be) transcribed in a turn-taking manner, often preceded by speaker tags (Q. and A. here) and without a reporting clause such as “she said” or “he replied.” It has been long obscured by the present dominance of “dialogue” in practice, and underestimated theoretically as a distinct novelistic textual form. The “transcript mode” was, nevertheless, a distinctive literary artifact in the early eighteenth century when “dialogue,” as Davis argues, was still in a nascent state of “a boringly unvarying ‘says I/ says he’ format” (357). The “transcript mode” is the textual instance of the material culture of “recording” and “transcription,” which news-storytellers once appropriated in the early eighteenth century and revived in the late twentieth century. In the early eighteenth century, to buttress the authenticity and factuality of popular criminal stories, early news-storytellers (represented by but not limited to Daniel Defoe) assumed the role of a “court reporter” or a stenographer as the social function of a court reporter became culturally elevated and acknowledged by legal authorities and commercial news media. In the late twentieth century, Truman Capote, Norman Mailer, John Hersey and other “new journalists” actively appropriated the transcript mode to foreground the reportorial practice of interviewing, recording, and transcribing in their news-stories.

While the transcript mode would never be a literary practice exclusive to a specific group of authors or periods, it enjoyed its most marked visibility and greatest popularity among news-storytellers in the early eighteenth and late twentieth centuries. The valorization of naturalistic, colloquial and nonliterary language, epitomized in the transcript mode, may be attributed to a literary (re-) formative process that spawned alternative and hybridized modes of literature and incorporated the language of the streets, news-media, and commercials. The valorization of the transcript mode in news-stories may be theoretically framed as an instance of what Bakhtin called “novelization,” in which the “language [of traditional genres] renews itself by incorporating extraliterary heteroglossia” and by “insert[ing]...a living contact with unfinished, still evolving contemporary reality” (*The Dialogic Imagination* 7).

To rephrase the early eighteenth century literary landscape in the context of Bakhtin’s “novelization,” the era was moving towards a new literary horizon of mass-media and popular culture, putting traditional literary ideas and forms under pressure to change. Though deeply grounded in the neoclassical tradition, as often epitomized in such words as wit, decorum, and grace, and represented by such “highbrow” dramatists and poets as John Dryden, William Congreve, Alexander Pope, and John Gay, the era also witnessed a growing public interest in various extraliterary discourses such as the conduct-book, criminal biography, epistolary literature, and news accounts

of natural disasters and paranormal phenomena. As Hammond argues, against the hegemonic genres there emerged a new literary practice of “thoroughly hybridized literary kinds,” “provok[ing] a backlash in those pockets of early eighteenth century cultural practice that valorized the amateur, gentlemanly, classically trained, allusive model of authorship” (8-9). In Rose Zimbardo’s estimation, the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were periods in which literary practice was marked by the transition “from imitation of nature as idea (heroic)...to imitation of the experiential actual (novelistic)” (48).

Zimbardo equates the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries with the periods of “the end of [neoclassic] drama and the beginning of the novel,” where the genre of drama faced “the demands of a polyglossic, extraliterary discourse,” and went through secularization, “strain[ing] the limits of dramatic form” (48). As Hammond and Zimbardo observe, literary practice in the early eighteenth century gravitated to what were then regarded as “hybridiz[ed] and debas[ed] literary forms,” assimilating the language of low styles in newspapers, streets, markets, and courtrooms. (Hammond 10; Rogers 33).

If the early eighteenth century is the era that gave birth to the novel, the late twentieth century – the sixties and seventies in particular – might be described as the era that heralded the death of the novel. The argument was, in a nutshell, that the novel as a literary form had been fully explored and

thoroughly exploited by the (high) modernists.¹⁵ The new journalism, as Phyllis Frus sees it, emerged as a challenge to hegemonic elitist literature, and posed a contradistinctive angle to it: the new journalists strategically resorted to a “countercultural, radical, or oppositional ‘low’ form,” and highlighted the language of popular culture and mass media (121-122). For Tom Wolfe, the new journalism is the second instance of “novelization” against the modernist literary convention that pursues the aura of “a higher reality,” “the cosmic dimension,” “eternal values,” and “the moral consciousness” — “a road that led them right back to the [eighteenth century-] classical tradition” (40).

It is worthwhile to note that what Wolfe sharply contrasts with the language of traditional novels, among other things, is the way speech activity is represented. He highlights the “extraordinary feats of reporting that new journalists undertook”: “record[ing] the dialogue in full” and “working on dialogue of the fullest, most completely revealing sort in the very moment when novelists were cutting back, using dialogue in more and more cryptic, fey and curiously abstract ways” (31-32). As Wolfe takes the new journalism as “an absolute rerun” of the early eighteenth century’s novelization, it may not

¹⁵ This sentiment towards the established forms of novels is reflected in such alternative and experimental generic titles as *surfiction*, the *nouveau roman*, *anti-novel*, and *metafiction*. The expression varied from the announcement of the imminent death of novels to the call for new experiment and renewal. For instance, in “The Literature of Exhaustion,” John Barth suggested that the reign of the novel would soon be on the decline. In “The Death of the Novel” and “Waiting for the End: The American Literary Scene,” Ronald Sukenick and Leslie Fiedler respectively found the form out-moded and over-used, and called for alternative forms to resuscitate and replenish the genre.

be a coincidence that critics find the new journalistic spirit in Defoe's work and tend to construe him as a precursor of twentieth-century literary nonfiction (Connery 18; Foley 108; Frus 161; Hartsock 117; Hellman 29; Hollowell 33; Skinner 143; Wolfe 37). Both the early new journalists and the later ones prioritized the bastard forms, deeply implicated in the popular culture of market-place and street. The transcript mode, I would argue, is a shared example of a speech form, with which they highlighted the nonliterary, colloquial, and naturalistic language of the times.

I have two related arguments: first, the transcript mode is a particular textual form of speech representation, which the news-storytellers incorporated into their stories to trigger the aura of "factuality" and "documentarity." Secondly, the transcript mode captures the human speech event differently from the paired dialogue mode, and needs to be regarded as a distinct subtype of speech that responded to the material culture of transcription in the early eighteenth and late twentieth centuries.

I will examine the cultural significance of the transcript mode and trace the trajectories of its conception in the early eighteenth century, as well as its re-emergence in the late twentieth century, with the "news-stories" that report a publicly known event, such as *A Journal of Plague Year*, *Due Preparation for the Plague*, *The True and Genuine Account of the Life and Actions of the Late Jonathan Wild*, and *A General History of Robberies and Murders of the Most Notorious Pirates*,

by Daniel Defoe; and *In Cold Blood*, *The Armies of the Night*, and *The Algiers Motel Incident* by the later news-storytellers.

2. The Conception and Re-Emergence of the "Transcript Mode" in the News-Stories of Daniel Defoe and the Later News-Storytellers

In its evolution as a literary genre, the novel was often characterized as a convergent literary practice influenced by various discourses such as history, drama, poetry, romance, and journalism (Hunter 5; Davis 7; Stevick 2). The multi-disciplinarity of novelistic discourse, or rather its undisciplined activity, is reflected in the struggle to characterize the new discourse with such descriptive names as the "comic epic-poem in prose" (*Joseph Andrews* 25) and the "parable or allegoric history brought to pass, viz., for moral and religious improvement" (*Serious Reflections during the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* xii). In the early eighteenth century, the novelists, in an attempt to articulate their disciplinarity, sought to assign and ascribe a certain discursive mode of its own to their work. They associated their discursive practice with, and dissociated it from, the writers of different professions such as historians, antiquarians, romance-writers, and poets. Defoe felt the need to differentiate *Robinson Crusoe*, allegedly a history, from "romance": when criticized for writing "a romance...all formed and embellished by invention,"

he claimed that “the story, though allegorical, is also historical” in his preface to *Serious Reflections* (ix).

Also, in the preface to *The True and Genuine Account of the Life and Actions of the Late Jonathan Wild*, Defoe contrasted his story with other kinds of “romance,” and claimed that he came to write the story of Jonathan Wild to “assure the world, that the greatest part of all that has hitherto appeared of this kind has been evidently invented” (224). Similarly in *Tom Jones*, Henry Fielding argued that “truth distinguishes our writings from those idle romances which are filled with monsters” while measuring and assessing other neighboring discourses (131). According to John Mullan, though early novels certainly shared the elements of romance to varying degrees, the novelists persistently contrasted their writing to romance (258). Their sustained effort is grounded not merely on the difference between textual elements and discursive conventions but also in a rhetorically postured and disciplinarily motivated conception.

The most relevant profession, with which the early novelists repeatedly refused to associate their writing, was that of the antiquarian. Before the antiquarians’ historiographical method – a “descriptive” enterprise of representing things and entities – was acknowledged by modern historians, they were not yet considered “historians” and “their studies did not fall into the category of the ‘proper’ grands récits” (Hall 14). The disciplinary dispute

arose from the antiquarians' distinctive discursive practice of "description." According to Stan Mendyk and Stuart Piggot, historians preferred "a chronological order" and valued the explanation of "a certain situation" – their primary objective being to educate or edify people with a story – and "regarded as trifling" antiquarians' practice of "description" and "observation" (Mendyk 10; Piggot 22-23).¹⁶ Antiquarians, in contrast, favored "a systematic order" and the description of "a thing or subject" in the domain of writing. They openly distanced their textual practice from that of historians, claiming that they had no truck with "the Virtues or Vices of Princes nor Serve for Example or Instruction to Posterity, which are the great ends of History and ought to be the chief Care of all historians" (qtd. in Piggot 23).

Though the early novelists were aware of the fact that their novelistic discourse necessarily involved the antiquarian practice of description, they sought to differentiate their discursive practice from that of antiquarians, while certainly preferring to assimilate their writing to that of historians. Henry Fielding, aligning his work with that of biographers, argued that while novelistic discourse concerns "the actions and characters of men, [antiquarians'] writings are not quite so authentic" in their purpose (*Joseph*

¹⁶ According to Stuart Piggot, the antiquarian enterprise was later reintroduced with a new cloak. Piggot observes: "the antiquaries may have been going down by 1726, but some were going down fighting.... They grope towards a new discipline that was eventually, but not before the late nineteenth century, to become archaeology" (Piggot 21-25).

Andrews 183). Daniel Defoe, in *A Tour Through the Whole Island*, a travelogue and topographic story, had to excuse or moderate, paradoxically, his interest in the antiquarian practice, for instance, by saying, "If antiquity takes with you, though the looking back into remote things is studiously avoided, yet it is not wholly omitted" (43). As Barringer claimed, narrative history, "though never one of Defoe's chief considerations in the *Tour*, is one of those 'interest[s],' which he was unable to ignore" (9).

Scholars such as Samuel Monk, Cynthia Wall, and Lincoln Faller observe that Defoe's novels in general lack the descriptive dimension. Defoe's *Tour*, if any, has a marked dimension of narrative, for "the language and imagery of the *Tour*...presume motion and change" (Wall, "Grammars of Space" 402). Monk argues that though "geography abounds [in *Colonel Jack* and *Moll Flanders*], no one can find a single observed *mise en scène*" or a descriptive portrait of a setting because the narration curbs "his readers [to] focus their attention on his characters' actions" (*Colonel Jack* xx-xxi). Wall in the same spirit characterizes Defoe's description as "a prompter of action": "[R]ather than describing an object in stasis, the spatial detail points to actual or potential motion, to the province of narrative" ("Details of Space" 398). In other words, Defoe's (pseudo-) description functions as, or at least anticipates, narrative. The peculiar status of description in Defoe's novels (and the novels of the early eighteenth century in general) reflects the textual politics operating among

disciplines when novelistic discourse was beginning to develop.¹⁷ Though the early novelists' textual preference for certain forms was never completely clear-cut, yet the novelists persistently pronounced their acceptance and rejection of specific textual modes.

When narrative/description polemics were still being debated, "dialogue" was not yet considered a distinctive part of novelistic discourse (Davis 356). "Dialogue," as a literary textual mode of representation, was introduced into novelistic discourse during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The incipient stage of dialogue is revealed in the paucity of its use in early novelistic discourse. In his statistical survey that focuses on the beginning and end of three hundred novelistic stories, Bonheim observes that the textual portion of dialogue before the eighteenth century remained at or below two percent whereas authorial commentary (or argument) occupied over ten percent and narrative, at least a third (192).

Besides these minor considerations, "dialogue" remained at the insecure and simple level of metronomic exchange, often repetitive and interruptive,

¹⁷ According to Dorothy Van Ghent, Werner Wolf, and Wall, novels in the early eighteenth century showed a marked deficiency in description (Wall, "Rhetoric of Description" 261; Ghent 34; Wolf 627). For instance, Wall observes: "Through the eighteenth century, 'topography,' as the rhetorical term for the description of landscape and places, climbed up from a lowly, ancillary, and often despised position in classical rhetorical theory to a fully-fledged glamour in the English and French novels of the nineteenth century, and then back again to suspect status in certain critical debates about the pretensions of realism in the twentieth century" ("Details of Space" 389).

when compared with much more complex contemporary speech forms such as interior monologue, free indirect speech, and other speech hybrids.

*There, says he, they are all dead; the Man and his Wife, and five Children. There, says he, they are shut up, you see a Watchman at the Door; and so of other houses. Why, says I, What do you here all alone? Why, says he, I am a poor desolate Man; it has pleased God I am not yet visited, tho' my Family is, and one of my Children dead. How do you mean then, said I, that you are not visited. Why, says he, that's my House, pointing to a very little low boarded House, and there my poor Wife and two Children live, said he, if they may be said to live.... (my underline *A Journal of the Plague Year* 103)*

While dialogue is now an integral part of contemporary novels, in the early eighteenth century, it had just started to grip on the then uncharted terrain of the novel, typically displaying an array of speech exchanges with cumbersome tags of speaker identification.

When “dialogue” was still in its inceptive stage, and “‘he said/she said’ [was] invariably the rule” (Davis 357), the “transcript mode,” which Defoe termed variously “conference,” “conversation” and “dialogue,” prevailed as a distinctive literary artifact in his news-stories (*Due Preparation* 111, 140; *A General History* 286). In *A Journal*, while criticizing the “unprovided Condition,” “Want of timely [support],” and consequently “a prodigious Number of People

sunk in that Disaster,” Defoe tries to capture the instance of the plague’s rampage and the people’s response of confusion in the form of transcription. The narration shifts to the transcript mode after a short use of a transient dialogue mode that serves as a buffer zone between narrative and full speech in the transcript mode:¹⁸

Says *John* the Biscuit Baker, one Day to *Thomas* his Brother, the Sail-maker, *Brother Tom, what will become of us? The plague grows hot in the City, and encreases this way: What shall we do?*

Truly, says Thomas, I am at a great Loss what to do, for I find, if it comes down into Wapping, I shall be turn’d out of my Lodging: And thus they began to talk of it beforehand.

John, Turn’d out of your Lodging, Tom! If you are, I don’t know who will take you in; for People are so afraid of one another now, there’s no getting a Lodging any where.

Tho. Why? The People where I lodge are good civil People, and have Kindness enough for me too; but they say I go abroad every Day to my Work, and it will be dangerous; and they talk of locking themselves up, and letting no Body come near them.

¹⁸ Dialogue as a transient stage into and out of the transcript mode is not untypical in Defoe’s works, and is found in such stories as *A Journal* (118, 127, 132), *A General History* (250), *The Late Jonathan Wild* (247, 248), *Due Preparation* (96, 116, 120, 124), and *Roxana* (124, 127).

John, *Why, they are in the right to be sure, if they resolve to venture staying in Town.*

Tho. *Nay, I might e'en resolve to stay within doors too, for, except a Suit of Sails that my Master has in Hand, and which I am just a finishing, I am like to get no more Work a great while; there's no Trade stirs now; Workmen and Servants are turned off everywhere, so that I might be glad to be lock'd up too. But I do not see they will be willing to consent to that, any more than to the other.* (118-119)

While its basic layout (the identification of speaker followed by speech) resembles the speech characteristic of drama, as Davis, Rogers, and Gladfelder characterize it in such terms as “theatrical script,” “dramatic dialogue,” and “play format” (356; 157; 63), the language is rough-hewn and flatly prosaic, and does not show the merest inkling of the versification expected in the neoclassical period.

In fact, the speech of the transcript modes in Defoe's news-stories studied here — *The Journal of the Plague Year*, *Due Preparation for the Plague*, *The True and Genuine Account of the Life and Actions of the Late Jonathan Wild*, and *A General History of Robberies and Murders of the Most Notorious Pirates* — does not retain any trace of the metering (iambic pentameter) and formal measures (spacing and coupling) typical of the drama forms of the early eighteenth century. His language tends to be drawn-out, plainly prosaic and matter-of-

fact, and numerous colons, semi-colons and dashes organize and regulate the rumpled and unrestrained terrain of speech representation.

Though Defoe rarely specified the mode he frequently resorted to, an example of clarification occurred when his readers took *The Family-Instructor* (which is represented in a transcript mode throughout) as a “play.” As to “some [who] have call’d it a Religious Play,” he makes clear that the language of drama is inadequate for his purpose: “It would more have answer’d that Title...[if I had] made it a Drammatick Poem; But the Subject was too solemn, and the Text too copious, to suffer the Restraint” (“Preface”). The language he has in mind is more sober and plain than elaborate and ornate, and literary language inflicts “restraint.” Though he appears to tolerate the readers’ misconception (“As to its being called a Play, be it called so if they please”), he regarded the mode he incorporated for speech representation as something very “new,” as he argues in the “Preface” (“the way I have taken for this, is entirely New”) and then repeats in the “Introduction” (“the Method is new, as is said above”).

Though one may argue that the formal features may have provided the readers with familiarity, it is at odds with Defoe’s intent and the literary spirit of the times to subsume the transcript mode under the category of drama. To the contrary, I would like to align its language and its representation mode with what Bakhtin called “novelistic dialogue[s],” which quality (the “lifelike

concreteness" and "naturalistic quality") "so sharply distinguishes them from dramatic dialogues" (365). The introduction of the transcript mode is characterized under Bakhtin's theoretical frame as a literary re-formative instance of moving away from the tradition of drama and moving "closer to the conversational norm" of the day (397). The conception and establishment of the "transcript mode" can be better attributed to the tide of the new literary culture that valorized extraliterary language or redefined literary language. The literary adaptation of transcript mode (and legal proceeding format) is an instance of Bakhtin's "novelization" — the hybridization of traditional stories in which the writers appropriated "extra-artistic" genres to render more untraditional, anticanonical, and nonartistic stories (320).

In the early eighteenth century, for the transaction of the new discourse, the early novelists adapted a peculiar strategy of identifying themselves as the ones who edited, recorded, and transcribed the story instead of the ones who authored it. Being in a literary culture where "overt fictionality or artificiality ceased to be an attractive or profitable feature," the early novelist almost always masqueraded himself as a scribe who introduced the story to the world as a mundane historical document (Richetti 5). The titular description of Defoe's news-story, *The Late Jonathan Wild*, claimed that the story was "taken from [Jonathan Wild's] own mouth, and collected from papers of his own writing," and regarded other versions as fabricated. In the title page of A

Journal, he takes the role of an excavator who exposed the “memorials,” by “a Citizen who continued all the while in London,” to the world for the first time (“Never made publick before”). In *Due Preparation*, a more essayistic storytelling about the plague, he asserts that he “recorded [the conversation] for the example of others in like case” (140). In the same spirit, novels such as *Moll Flanders* and *Roxana* emphasized either that the original manuscript was merely altered to “speak Language fit to be read” (3), or that the editorial modification was minimally done to “conceal Names and Persons” for protection (35). Numerous novelistic stories at the time confirm this widespread phenomena and for the moment, let it suffice to say that the early novelists presented their fictional stories as historical and factual documents.

What should be noted is that literary culture actively foregrounded the role of editor, recorder, and transcriber over the role of the artist, and prioritized historical “veracity” over novelistic “verisimilitude.” Even the shortcomings and ineptitude of the recorder and transcriber are exposed and excused as a way of securing an air of empirical factuality. While stressing the point of “recording” the conversation as “a Pat[t]ern for all poor Men to follow,” Defoe concedes the possibility of being at fault (“whether my Account be exactly according to Fact or no”), and then justifies his story by arguing that the recorded “Story has a Moral in every Part of it”: “if there was no other End in recording it, I think this a very just one” (*A Journal* 118). In the preface to *A*

General History, Defoe underlines his extensive research (“Having Taken more than ordinary Pains in collecting the Materials which compose the following History”) and warns the readers of the possibility of its being “monstrously faulty” because the story is from “the Reports of illiterate Men” (1, 6). A more illustrative case is found in Fielding’s version of Jonathan Wild story. Here, Fielding refers to the status of “recording” more explicitly, with the emphasis on the role of the first-hand note-taker in “shorthand” and on that of the transcriber who would recover the full quality of the original. Shortly, he explains at the footnote that part of the record was “so blotted that it was illegible” (206).

[U]nhappily we could procure only the substance of a single conference, which was taken down in shorthand by one who overheard it. We shall transcribe it, therefore, exactly in the same form and words we received it. [...]

Jonathan. Ay, who indeed? I assure you, doctor, I had much rather be happy than miserable. But†

.

Ordinary. Nothing can be plainer. St

.

Jonathan. If

Once convinced

no man lives of . . .
 . . . whereas sure the
 clergy . . . opportunity . . . better (205-206)

If the incomplete transcription has any purpose or contribution to his storytelling, it is simply to establish that he tried to transcribe “exactly in the same form and words” – but failed. Interestingly, this crucial moment of textual cruxes is where the failure of the transcription paradoxically becomes the claim for the empirical factuality of the record.¹⁹ To a considerable degree, the novelistic discourse that claims factual status in the early eighteenth century intentionally forsakes the literary-artificial status of the story and, instead, asserts its mundane documentarity. Defoe’s and Fielding’s valorization of “recording” and “transcribing” captures the atmosphere of the era, in which the function of the mediator (or technician) of language over the artist of language was more appreciated, appropriated, and consequently exploited in the commercial-literary market.

The valorization of “real speech” and the accentuation of the role of the recorder in news-stories, in fact, have a long history in early commercial

¹⁹ Fielding consistently highlights the empirical status of a speech, either by arguing the completeness of the transcription or by admitting the limitation. Before presenting chapter VIII in the transcript mode as a whole, the narrator observes: "From this person I received the following dialogue, which he assured me he had overheard and taken down verbatim" (143). Another instance of the failed transcription occurs in Chapter X, in which he excuses the incompleteness of the transcription, for "The beginning of this speech is lost" (197).

journalism where pamphleteers and new-ballad writers ritually included “the last dying speeches” of criminals, allegedly verbatim and at full length (Faller 8, 25). The reading public demanded a more detailed account of criminals, and in particular, the actual words of their last days. The news-media competition escalated even to the point where ordinaries were bribed to secure the “words” of criminals at the Newgate prison (Harris 18-19). Sometimes a last dying speech was negotiated and transacted with the criminal during his lifetime (22).

Langbein points out that “[f]rom the later 1710’s an ever increasing number of OBSP [Old Bailey Sessions Papers] cases are reported in greater detail, with testimony attributed to individual witnesses and defendants” (270); and the proceedings are expanded from “a broadsheet to an eight-page pamphlet” to meet the demand of the market (Gladfelder 60). The format of legal proceedings is visibly affected by the cultural affirmation of “real speech” because the courtroom interaction is primarily the verbal exchange. While the earlier proceedings were predominantly narrative (in summary), towards the early eighteenth century, the proceedings spared more space for speech than for narrative summary in the following manner.

Thomas Bond depos'd. That he found the Deceased in a back
Room lying on her Face naked, and with a Door upon her; on the
5th Instant in the Evening afterwards, he met the Prisoner, and

asked him where his Wife was? To which he answer'd, he could not tell, she was not come home yet; to which this Deponent reply'd, I believe you have kill'd her, desiring him to come and see her, which he refused...

John Page depos'd. When I heard the Prisoner was taken, I went and examined him, and this he confess'd himself to me, My Wife and I quarrell'd on Wednesday and she going out I follow'd her, and by the Way seeing some Stones, I flung 'em at her...

(“Thomas Nash”)

The early eighteenth-century legal transcription often combined indirect speech with direct speech instead of a word-for-word representation, typically in the form of “[the speaker] deposed that,” and later toward the mid-eighteenth century, direct speech in the “verbatim” fashion rapidly replaced this convention.

William Montgomery. I am a Cabinet ma'er, and the Deceased work'd with me in the same Workshop. On the 24 of March, the Prisoner came in, and asked the Deceas'd to toss up for Beer with him; he told him, he would toss up for no Beer. Then the Prisoner would Fight him for a dozen of Beer, and the Deceased said, No, if he must fight, it should be with a Man, and not with him. [...]

Q. Was the Skull broke?

Montgomery. Yes. I observed the Wound; and saw the Skull was broke.

Q. Were there no more Blows given?

Montgomery. No.

Q. How long did the Deceased live after this?

Montgomery. He died on the 18th Day after the Blow, and he died of that Wound, to my Knowledge; for he was my Bed-fellow; I lay with him till three or four Days before he died.

(“Henry Bosworway”)

The court reporters tried to present actual wordings of a trial, transforming transcription practice from narrative summary to indirect/direct speech interaction. The capacity to fully and accurately capture real speech was not only appreciated for courtroom verbal interaction but also for sermons, public addresses, and other speech activities.

The public interest in real speech is reflected by the burgeoning publications related to “recording” and “transcription” technology published in increasingly thicker volumes. Samuel Botley’s stenography guidebook, printed in 1705, had thirty five pages and highlighted its “*plainest and easiest method*.” In 1707, Elisha Coles published *The newest, plainest and best short-hand extant* in thirty one pages, and Francis Tanner, *The plainest, easiest, and prettiest method of writing short-hand, ever yet published* in fifty two pages in 1712.

Stenography reaches its heyday with larger volumes (mostly over one hundred pages) and higher frequencies through James Weston in the seventeen thirties and forties. They typically advertised the practicality and efficiency of the method as being "regular," "easy" and "plain," and highlighted stenography as a technique applicable to "all Speeches, Homelies, Tryals, [and] Sermons" and "useful to all Persons of Learning, and Business Whatsoever" (Tanner, "The Preface").

Defoe was a skilled practitioner who availed himself of the newly emerging aesthetic. Besides the hybridized forms of popular literature in the street and market such as newspapers, travelogues, and criminal biographies, Defoe was also familiar with a legal prose style used in trial proceedings formats and transcript modes. He was well versed in various aspects of the legal procedures from Newgate, where prisoners were confined, to trials at Old Bailey and the gallows at Tyburn.²⁰ He composed a considerable number of stories that include criminal acts and legal consequences (for instance, *Moll Flanders*, *Roxana*, *The Late Jonathan Wild*, *Jack Sheppard*, and most of the criminal stories in *A General History*) and produced other numerous news-reports on trials and executions, so much that one modern critic complained:

²⁰ Defoe was regularly tried at the Old Bailey and imprisoned at the Newgate (Gladfelder 96). As he warned the readers of "a Criminal Use" of his examples and descriptions in the preface to *Roxana*, his familiarity with the criminal world included "the mechanics of thieving and the technique of fencing" (Rogers 155). For a useful overview of this dimension in Defoe's life, see Lincoln Faller's *Crime and Defoe*.

“It is the greatest pity in the world that the novel began in the eighteenth century. The press reporter Defoe laid his stodgy hand on it and his fingerprints are still all over it” (A General History xii). As a reporter for newspapers (John Applebee’s Weekly Post) and his own (Whiteball Evening Post), he was long familiar with criminal issues and legal prose styles – trial proceedings formats and transcript modes (Rogers 19-20). Framing “Of Captain Anstis, And his Crew” in the form of the trial proceedings, Defoe explained that “their [the pirates’] Speeches were very laconick, and their whole Proceedings concise,” and thus he prefers to “give it by Way of Dialogue,” by which he meant the “transcript mode” (A General History 286). “Of Captain Bartho. Roberts, And his Crew” also embeds “The Tryals of the Pyrates” in the form of proceedings, alternating narrative summary and indirect/direct speeches (237). Defoe also incorporated the transcript mode with varying degrees in such “news-stories” as A Journal of Plague Year, Due Preparation for the Plague, and The Late Jonathan Wild, and novels such as Colonel Jack, Captain Singleton, Robinson Crusoe, Serious Reflections During the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, and Roxana.

After Daniel Defoe, arguably the first “new journalist,” retrospectively speaking, the transcript mode undergoes its major empowerment in the news-stories of the nineteen sixties and seventies. The transcript mode re-emerged as a distinctive textual form in the late twentieth century as a discursive response

to the transforming culture of recording and transcription. The portable tape recorder became widely visible in the spheres of public life and offered the manageable preservation of, and unprecedented accuracy to, human speech interaction. These portable tape recorders with an affordable price became available in the nineteen fifties and made it possible for any individual to record human speech interaction in high fidelity and to replay the interaction almost “indefinitely” (Edwards 341).

Towards the seventies, tape recorders also influenced reporting practice in a fundamental way, restructuring the curricula of journalism schools, which began “requiring students to gain some experience with the recorders,” and making shorthand and longhand noting uncompetitive and disadvantageous in many areas of reporting. “The biggest advantage” was that “[t]he machine record[ed]...everything [which] even the best of reporters, working with pencil and paper, [could] not do” (Sherwood 58, 62). Sometimes, the reporters were asked from the newspaper to use the tape recorder to avoid the charge of “misquote” and “misreport” (64). The social visibility of tape recorders varied from the domestic “news conferences held by [presidential] candidates” to the “interviews conducted with servicemen in bunkers in Vietnam.” Because of the compatibility and convenience of the tape-recorder, its use further expanded to other professionals such as social researchers, ethnographers, or biographers,

and “enabled the talented, intelligent nonjournalist to compete on equal terms with the professional journalist” (59).

While tape-recording and note-taking coexisted and complemented each other, the tape recorder was an important cultural icon of the news-media that tried to effect a sense of reliability and factuality. The later journalist-novelists actively appropriated the transcript mode to articulate their unique status as reporter-writers. Mailer, Capote and Hersey, for instance, among other “new journalists,” consistently employed the transcript mode when reporting historical events. Mailer regularly resorted to the transcript mode in most of his news-stories. He captured the first lunar landing in the form of a transcript in *Of a Fire on the Moon*, employed transcript again in his account of the legendary fight of Muhammad Ali and George Foreman in *The Fight*, and used the technique in other works, including *The Executioner's Song* and *Miami and the Siege of Chicago*.

In *The Algiers Motel Incident*, Hersey reconstructed the story of the Detroit riot primarily in the transcript mode, based on his own interviews and court testimonies, and also adopted the mode for such fictions as *Too Far to Walk*, *Blues*, *The Call*, and *The Child Buyer*. Using the transcript mode, Capote crafted “Handcarved Coffins,” another crime nonfiction work, as a full conversation between “TC” (Truman Capote himself) and the sheriff, and “Conversational Portrait” between “TC” and other historical characters such as

Marilyn Monroe, Mary Sanchez, his room cleaner, and Robert Beausoleil, a serial killer associated with Charles Manson.

3. The Transcript Mode: Its Constituents and Practices

The transcript mode differs from the dialogue mode in its formal constituents and assumptions about human speech. While “dialogue” is aesthetically “worked out” for the dramatization of a scene in which characters verbally interact, “transcript” is primarily designed to rhetorically enhance the sense of a real life utterance. Since it is presumed to capture naturally occurring speech, it often preserves superfluous wording, grammatical errors, and nonlinguistic features, which may be suppressed in the dialogue construction. At the same time, it occupies a separate textual space where the narrator’s presence is repressed almost to naught, while dialogue allows the space in which the narrator mediates and colors the speech situation (often with the use of verbs and adjectives). What we experience in the transcript mode is a series of clashes between two voices. Since it does not describe a scene or narrate an action, it flattens visibility while accelerating audibility. The following courtroom verbal interaction is part of a long, drawn-out conversation between a witness, Julia Hysell, and a defense attorney in the transcript mode:

Q. And I asked you who this was.

A. I am not sure. I don't want to say.

Q. In your best recollection and judgment, who was it?

A. I don't know. There was four or five fellows standing around.

Q. Did you know any of them?

A. Not then.

Q. Not then?

A. No. I had seen them.

Q. Did you know them subsequently?

A. I know them vaguely.

Q. What are their names?

A. I don't know their last name....

Q. All right. Did you thereafter learn their names?

A. Their first names. I never bother with last names....

(The Algiers Motel Incident 43)

The transcript mode often remains grammatically errant ("There was four or five fellows"), syntactically fractured ("Not then" – "Not then?"), and conversationally implicated ("What are their names?" – "I don't know their last name...").²¹ That is, it is flatly prosaic at the level of the naturally occurring

²¹ I'm referring to the aspect of language use that is highly contingent on the conversational context rather than on the meaning of utterances. The attorney asked if she knew their names without specifying what part of the names, and Julia answered to the

speech. It is not space-effective in terms of the amount of information given to the readers, nor does it particularly dramatize the speech situation. It differs in its style and effect from the dialogue mode that compresses and contrives the verbal interaction in a literary manner. The conversation may be elaborated in a few sentences when put into the dialogue mode:

“Did you know any of them?” the attorney asked.

“Vaguely,” said Hysell with her usual evasive tone.

“Did you thereafter learn their names?” The attorney was resolved to have their names — without much success.

Further, when compared with the dialogue mode, the transcript mode aspires to preserve nonlinguistic features: false starts, pauses, overlapping conversation, and superfluous sounds such as laughter, intelligible voices, and other noises. While the “natural speech” effect is minimized in news-stories of the early eighteenth century, there are still attempts to capture this phonetic feature in both Defoe and Fielding. A Londoner, “John,” who tries to leave the city to escape the plague, has a violent dispute with a city constable who, as an official measure to seal the city, prevents him from passing a fortified line.

effect that she only knew their first names. Literally speaking, however, Julia never said that she knew any part of the names. She did not *say* that she knew the first names, but she *implicated* it. In other words, “what is said” differs from “what is implicated.” What H.P. Grice termed “Implicature” is a distinctive feature of ordinary conversation in which communication is often complemented by non-literal meaning. For a brief discussion of “Implicature,” see H. P. Grice, “Presupposition and Conversational Implicature,” *Radical Pragmatics* by P. Cole (1981).

Const. Since you threaten us, we shall take Care to be strong enough for you: I have Orders to raise the County upon you.

John. It is you that threaten, not we: And since you are for Mischief, you cannot blame us, if we do not give you time for it; we shall begin our March in a few Minutes.*

Const. What is it you demand of us? (*A Journal* 133)

to which he footnoted with the explanation of a change in the constable's vocal tone: "This frightened the Constable and the People that were with him, that they immediately changed their Note." Fielding also makes a comment on the ordinary's pronunciation and speculates about a possible wording.

Ordinary. ... I then proceeded to draw some inferences from the whole*; in which I am mightily deceived if I did not convince you that you yourself was one of those ANGELS...

(*Jonathan Wild* 206)

The asterisk is then footnoted: "He pronounced this word HULL, and perhaps would have spelt it so."

The rhetorical effect of "natural speech" is carefully implemented by the later news-storytellers in a more calculated way. For instance, the phonetic features are reflected in the use of the ellipsis for the shift of tonal change or for toning down and the use of the dash to signify overlapping or interruption.

Q. This was true not only locally but on a Federal level?

A. Yes, sir....

Q. Do you know how many statements have been taken from you?

A. Not offhand. I mean, there was quite a few of them, I know.

[[...]] I have been questioned several times by these people.

THE COURT: By whom?

A. By these people. The FBI—

THE COURT: Oh.

A. —and the Homicide. Also during the lie-detector test there was a lot of questions asked there.

(The Algiers Motel Incident 252)

The transcript mode does not necessarily entail literal correspondence to the original speech; its construction and effect are more rhetorical than real. For instance, Capote never used a recorder when he was conducting an interview; neither did he take notes when he was engaged in it (Plimpton, *Truman Capote* 202). Nevertheless, with the prevalent use of square brackets, he implies that he recorded, transcribed, and minimally edited the conversation to help the readers identify the pronouns and spatial/temporal deixes in the following (untagged) transcript mode:

“Well, it has been so long since I worked out there. I thought there was a safe. I knew there was a cabinet of some kind.... The next thing I knew he [Hickock] was talking about robbing Mr. Clutter.” [...]

“You didn’t...say anything at all to Mr. Hickock to discourage him from coming out here to rob and kill the Clutter family?”

“No. Anybody tells you anything about that up there [Kansas State Penitentiary], you don’t pay any attention to it because you think they are just talking anyway.”

“You mean you talked that way and didn’t *mean* anything? Didn’t you mean to convey to him [Hickock] the idea that Mr. Clutter had a safe? You wanted Mr. Hickock to believe that, did you not?”

(*In Cold Blood* 318)

The square bracket is specifically designed to suggest that the original speech is nearly intact and that the editorial marking is merely auxiliary. Capote consistently implemented the marking in the transcript mode throughout *In Cold Blood* (126, 164, 192, 193, 194, 226, 294, 315, 339, 367), and Hersey did the same to a lesser degree in *The Algiers Motel Incident* (22, 42, 46, 98, 102, 197, 297, 316, 326).

If comparatively rare, the square bracket is also found in Defoe, and is measured for the same effect—to clarify the identity of the referred. The first person narrator Roxana provides the readers with a speech exchange in the transcript mode, in which her servant “Amy,” while talking to a gentleman, refers to “Roxana” as “her Mistress” and “his Wife” in the third person. The narrator Roxana clarifies these appellative nouns.

Amy. None of the neighbours could tell me what was become of my poor Mistress, only that they said, she was so poor, that it was next to begging; that some of the neighbouring Gentlefolks had reliev'd her, or that else she must have starv'd; then she went on, and told him, that after that, they never heard any more of [me] her Mistress; but that she had been seen once or twice in the City.... if any such thing had happen'd while he was there; that he left [me] his Wife, all the Money he had in the World, but 25 *l.* which was as little as he could take with him...

(Roxana 126, 127)

In a playful mock trial a pirate impersonates a prisoner and addresses another pirate, “George Bradley,” who plays the judge, and Defoe identifies the ironical role, which George Bradley performs.

Pris. An't please your Worship's Honour, my Lord, I am as honest a poor Fellow as ever went between Stem an Stern of a

ship...but I was taken one George Bradley [the Name of him that
 sat as Judge,] a notorious Pyrate, a sad Rogue as ever was
 unhang'd, and he forc'd me, an't please your Honour.

(*A General History* 287)

While there are various other editorial markers, which are *meant* to assist the reading of the original speech – mostly round bracket, ellipsis, asterisk, and dash²² – what the early news-storyteller and the later ones strove to achieve with their editorial interruptions is the effect of the transcription as the near approximation of the original conversation.

If the editorial marking in the transcript mode reinforces the sense of the pre-existing materiality of a speech event, which the news-reporters edited and refined for enhanced readability, another equally effective textual strategy is to (pretend to) leave them unedited and intact. To highlight the orality of naturally evolving speech, news-storytellers often present the speech interaction as if it were pristine and raw. Among the speech elements that enhance the effect of realistic speech interaction with a marked prominence of orality is what discourse analysts called a “pragmatic marker” (also known as “discourse marker”). As Andreas Jucker observes in the study on various genres in early modern England, the pragmatic marker is distinctly indicative

²² Mailer and Hersey frequently made use of round brackets to provide extralinguistic features such as gestures and immediate context of the utterance in *The Executioner's Song* and *The Algiers Motel Incident*. The asterisk is found in Mailer's *The Armies of the Night* to screen four lettered words (16, 64).

of orality, and is found in the genres that foreground spoken language: drama in its entirety, fiction with the “account of conversations between the characters,” and legal proceedings, “a more or less faithful account of the spoken interaction in the courtroom” (210-211). While its function and formality may vary, the “pragmatic markers” refer to the attention-soliciting utterances such as “y’know,” “(you) see,” “(it’s) like,” “I mean,” “I say” “look (here)” and “listen,” and, with a more spontaneous and interjectional nature, “oh,” “yeah,” “well,” “so,” and “why.”

Q. So, midnight on the 25th you are invited to leave room 2 by Bubbles?

A. No, Bubbles—yeah, oh, that’s right, yeah. He asked us did we want to go play cards, and we said no....

Q. Well, what else happened?

A. We got up, and we had been watching television, and we got up, and we decided we were hungry, but we know we couldn’t go out on the street because, you know, of the curfew and that, so we started walking around the pool, because there was some people there that, you know, they had food at the Motel.

Q. They had what? (my underline *The Algiers Motel Incident* 121)

Hersey and Defoe in particular employed pragmatic markers with a striking frequency to expose the dimension of evolving orality to the fullest.

Sometimes, they intentionally preserved the pragmatic markers to a distracting level, letting them repeat over and over again. What follows are just a few examples of superfluous pragmatic markers that Hersey left unrevised in his (untagged) transcript modes.

'Let's see, we moved around some. I've been in Detroit for twenty-six years, and Fred's father, he's had the one job, machine operator, Thompson Products, the same job for twenty-three, twenty-four years. Let's see, he went, let's see, to Catherine B.'

(23)

'See, when I taken Chancey to the undertakers to see Auburey, you know, we got ready, I was going to touch his head, you know, I wanted to feel of him, you know.'

(48)

'[Y]ou've probably seen them in previous riots there, you know, motorcycle pants and all that there. These fellows here were standing by with their bayonets and everything else. These are the fellows that ride the motorcycles and drive alone in cars. These fellows, you know, were ready and everything else there.'

(62)

Pragmatic markers indicate the language use categories that do not contribute to the meaning of speech but instead pertain to the contextual and procedural aspect of speech. As Britt Erman defines them, with “little or no meaning in themselves,” the pragmatic markers do not affect “the propositional content of the utterance” at the semantic level but only pertain to the speech situation at the discourse level (1339). Since the news-storytellers try to render speech interaction in a mimetically more conversational way, they tend (or pretend) to preserve the pragmatic markers in the transcript modes as if to remind the readers of how people actually speak in everyday conversation. In Defoe’s transcript modes, the pragmatic markers (now mostly obsolete ones such as “Ay,” “Marry,” “Sirrah,” “Hearkee,” “Well,” “Why,” “I say,” and “Pray (you)” or “Prithee”) add a special dynamics of orality to the speech interaction.²³ Again, the following is the mock-trial scene in the legal proceeding format in “Of Captain Anstis and his Crew.”

Judge. – Hearkee me, Sirrah, – you lousy, pittiful, ill-look’d Dog; what have you to say why you should not be tuck’d up immediately, and set a Sun-drying like a Scarecrow? – Are you guilty, or not guilty?

Pris. Not guilty, an’t please your Worship.

²³ “Pray/prithee” marks a request, being an equivalent of “please.” “Hark/Harkee” demands attention (like contemporary “listen” or “look”). “Sirrah” also demands attention as a form of derogatory address in the courtroom. For a more complete discussion of the pragmatic markers, see Kryk-Kastovsky.

Judge. Not guilty! say so again, Sirrah, and I'll have you hang'd without any Tryal. [[...]]

Pris. Pray, my Lord, I hope your Lordship will consider –

Judge. Consider! – How dare you talk of considering? – Sirrah, Sirrah, I never consider'd in all my life. – I'll make it Treason to consider.

Pris. But, I hope, your Lordship will hear some Reason.

Judge. D'ye hear how the Scoundrel prates? – What have we to do with Reason? – I'd have you to know, Raskal, we don't sit here to hear Reason; – we go according to Law. – Is our Dinner ready?

Attor. Gen. Yes, my Lord.

Judge. Then heark'ee, you Rascal at the Bar; hear me, Sirrah, hear me. – You must suffer, for three Reasons....

(my underline 286-288)

The conversation proceeds and swerves with a distinctive display of the pragmatic markers ("Heark'ee," "Pray," and "Sirrah"). The pragmatic markers thus make the conversation more energetic and lively, signaling the shift of emphasis, topic, and floor between the two interlocutors. They facilitate the conversational turn-taking by initiating the onset of one's speech with attention-soliciting utterances. As Barbara Kryk-Kastovsky observes, the

interpersonal dynamics of spoken language, particularly turn-taking – the feature she considers to be distinctively that of an oral speech – are “performed by, among others, discourse markers like *now, then, well then*” (210).

What follows is the conversation between a son and his mother who envisions imminent disaster. While the flow of the conversation rests tangentially on the contextual situation, the pragmatic markers modulate the trafficking of the conversation

Son. Why, madam, you would put us all into confusion. You would fright us and terrify us so that we must shut up our shops, embargo our ships, close our ports; the Custom House would have no business, the Exchange no merchants, the merchandise no market.

Mother. I say again, oh that I could see such a sight in London! It is true it would be as you described it, and indeed it ought to be.

Son. God forbid, madam. Why, we should be all frightened out of our wits.

Mother. Ay, ay, I wish I could see them so out of their wits as that comes. (102)

Below is another instance of conversation between two brothers, and here the conversation shifts from the dialogue mode to the fully-fledged transcript mode.

[H]is brother was just going to open the door again to go out too, but he said, "Don't go out, brother. I want to speak with you." So his brother sat down, and seeing him look a little disordered, he said, "What's the matter, brother? Have you heard any bad news?"

2nd Brother. Ay, ay, bad news enough, I assure you. We are all undone at last.

1st Brother. What is it? What, do you hear any more of the plague?

2nd Brother. Any more of it! Why, 'tis come into the city. There is one dead in the next street to us almost; 'tis but in Bearbinder Lane.

1st Brother. What! of the plague itself?

2nd Brother. Ay, indeed! My Lord Mayor sent two surgeons to search the body, and they have both given it in that he died of the plague. He was a Frenchman. I told you how it would be.

1st Brother. Well, but this may be some straggling loose
fellow... (124)

Due Preparation has nine major instances of the transcript mode, separated by a set of narrations and dialogues. In the transcript modes, the reader is bombarded with an overwhelming number of pragmatic markers. In the first three transcript modes (96-111; 116-123; 124-126), Defoe discharges them in an unrestrained way, repeating, for instance, "why" (25 times), "well" (20), "oh" (14), "ay" (13), "I (can) assure you" (6), "I say" (10), exclusive of other countless variants such as "I would say," "that is to say," and "as I said." Also repeated are "I (must) tell you," "Alas," "indeed," "hark'e," and "pray/prihee." As the examples illustrate, the transcript mode displays a marked prominence of orality with the pragmatic markers.²⁴ In a naturally occurring conversation, our language rushes forth, repeats, revises, and

²⁴ The distinctive preservation of the pragmatic markers in the transcript modes is well contrasted with the dialogue modes (95-96; 113-114; 116; 124).

The young lady was in her chamber one morning when her brother, having been out about this affairs, came home in a very great concern, and coming up to her door, "Oh, sister," says he, "we are all done." "Undone!" says his sister; "what's the matter?" He could not speak again for a while; but as his sister was frighted, and pressed him again with repeating the words, "What's the matter?" at last he cries out again, "We are all undone, sister. My mother and you were both in the right – the PLAGUE IS BEGUN." (113)

If the scene were presented in the transcript mode, it might well have contained the pragmatic markers to reflect the highly emotional, expressive, and interpersonal aspect of the speech interaction. In the dialogue mode, what might have been the pragmatic markers are mostly absorbed and dissolved in the contextual narration (as indicated by underlines). Since the transcript mode is void of the description that explains the atmosphere and context of speech interaction, these pragmatic markers serve as indicators of the interpersonal and situational context of the conversation.

deviates.²⁵ And almost habitually, we alert, check, and remind each other with pragmatic markers in the line of conversing. In a real life conversation, repetition is not necessarily a stylistic defect or thematic emphasis, but a fundamental condition of a naturally occurring speech interaction. It is an unmarked practice so that we hardly notice it as interruptive and distracting.

While the pragmatic markers are emphatically indicative of a naturally occurring speech event, when transcribed word for word into a written form, the persistent repetition exhausts the readers' attention and, for some scholars, it is certainly too much to bear. The most representative case is Defoe's *A Journal of the Plague Year*. While Defoe exploits the features of oral storytelling with *A Journal* as a whole, focusing on an instance of an on-the-spot experience of the plague, the narration of *A Journal* meanders from subject to subject and from place to place, risking "a needless Digression," as Defoe observes (12), with the accompanying pragmatic markers, "I say" and its variants (such as "as I have said," "I may say indeed," "I shall speak again," and "I shall explain further"). As Walter Ong observes the "repetition of the-just-said" to be characteristically "oral" in that it keeps track of the evolving conversation (37),

²⁵ Repetition includes a word, a phrase, and sometimes even a whole sentence. For instance in *The Algiers Motel Incident*: "I lost a son. That's all that matters to me. The rest of the world I'm not worried over it: I've lost a son. I have lost a son" (9); "he ain't been right since. He ain't been right since" (18); "I didn't—I didn't see anything" (114); and "he told me, he told me and Auburey and Sortor" (207); "...was prejudiced in the first place. They was taught to be prejudiced in the first place" (273). For examples of the false starts and the instant revisions on the line of reasoning: "I asked him—I figured I was going to get railroaded" (252); "Because these people—you got to take into consideration I called these people" (252). "Me and James, he was—we was just talking" (309).

the narration of *A Journal* emphatically highlights this aspect of improvised speech by constantly diverting and refocusing the attention of the readers with the “I say/I said” attention-solicitors.

Watson Nicholson complains of its being overly and unnecessarily repetitive and confusing, with “a striking example of this [being] the ‘as-I-said-before’ habit” (88), and Frank Ellis finds it to create “serious attention-deficit problems for the reader” (78). The use of the pragmatic markers is one of the most prominently noted characteristics of *The Journal* and *The Algiers Motel Incident*, so much so that it reaches the point where Hersey observes it as the “rag-tags of inchoate continuation” (62), and Watson contends that when “[v]iewed from the point of style and art, [*The Journal*] is execrable” (90). While this crude and unrefined instance displayed by the transcript mode plagues and inflicts the fringes of the artistry, it certainly speaks for the actuality of spontaneous utterance at the moment of its natural unfolding of the speech event.

From the perspective of literary history, the “transcript mode” is not just raw material from which an effective dialogue is forged, but rather a literary mode of its own, designed under a different conceptual framework about human speech. The significance of the transcript mode does not only reside in the text; it serves to re-conceive the textual form in terms of its own materiality beyond the mere semantics of the text. In other words, the sense of “the real”

which the transcript mode evokes is not only produced in the text, which claims to testify about the world, but is simultaneously accompanied and conjured by the text, as a thing in itself and as the inscription of the language of the reported.

The transcript mode is a literary tour de force of news-stories, which the early journalist-novelists integrated into their stories from legalistic discourse, and which the later journalist-novelists actively foregrounded to stress their distinctive practice of interviewing, recording, and transcribing. Though the news-storytellers' assertion of ownership over certain textual forms was not practical and stable, their textual practices are neither discursively nondescript nor historically irrelevant. The news-storytellers, both in the early eighteenth and the late twentieth centuries, turned to the "transcript mode" to bear the weight of naturalistic speech as an authenticating device, and tried to uphold the empirical status of their "news-stories." The prominent display of the naturally occurring speech event can be visually exuberant and even anarchistic with the heightened focus on the instance of its colloquiality, repetition, and other diversions. Nevertheless, the undercurrent desire operating behind this seemingly crude and pristine representation of the speech event is the material-semiotic purchase of "the real" in its most fully realized form.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION:

TOWARDS A RHETORIC OF NEWS-STORYTELLING

By deliberately focusing on the news-storytellers' discursive practice to inscribe a sense of reality and reliability into their stories, I situated my inquiries beyond the level of story within the frame of storytelling. Of particular relevance to news-storytelling activities are the bibliographic efforts to engage neighboring stories and founding sources; the enduring commitment to qualify the roles of storytelling and cognitive frames of reference; and the editorial consideration to bear out the empirical status of news-stories. By conceiving textual representation primarily as an activity, I have sought to highlight the storytelling dimension in narratological analyses of news-stories.

This sustained valorization of the storytelling dimension involves the theoretical claim I want to make about the news-stories. The consideration of nonfictionality has less to do with what the stories describe and mean than with how they are produced and practiced as a socially situated, empowered discourse. That is, even when some news-stories are found to be patently flawed or boldly speculative in their referential relations to the real world, they still do not fall into the category of fiction, nor are they regarded as transgressing the boundary from nonfiction into fiction. Despite the referential

flaw or imaginative fiat, those news-stories still remain in the discourse of facts and factuality, and are judged to be stretched, fabricated, doctored, manipulated, or to even be a downright lie, but are not described and judged satisfactorily by the terms and values used for fiction.

The degree and precision of referential correspondence to the real world is crucial, of course, in order to make a *good* news-story. Yet, this referential accuracy, while of great concern in its own right, is only secondary in the construction of the genre. Of greater import is that a news-story finds its discursive distinction and empowerment as a historical discourse less in its referential accuracy than in its capacity to be compared with, related to, and assessed by, other neighboring stories. So, then, it is not the degree of referential factuality that categorizes a work into either fiction or a nonfiction, but it is the discourse of factuality that culturally regulates and enforces the distinctions and boundaries of the genre. As a separate, distinctive type of storytelling, news-stories can sustain and enrich the significance and function of the genre in their own convention of reading, criteria of judging, and materiality of discursive practice.

In this redefined discursive space, the poetics of a story (narrative plot, character development, and dialogue construction) becomes the rhetoric of storytelling through which the news-storytellers strive to convince the readers of the story world they constructed. In other words, the appreciation of its discursive distinction does not lie in experiencing the reality of the story world

so much as in recognizing the workings that underlie it. A historical person in the story is construed and defined as a character by storytelling him (or her) in one way rather than another. What he says, how he acts, and even the way he looks – the constituents of the story world – are indicators of ideologically loaded cultural artifacts and icons. More importantly, as readers, we are always already involved in the ethical acts of granting, suspecting, or refuting some particular embeddings of an event or a person, for instance, when Hersey imputes a mythical role of an archetypal originator of sin to Dick, the anti-hero of *In Cold Blood*, by initiating the readers to the character with the description of his “left eye being truly serpentine, with a venomous, sickly-blue squint” (43).

By defining news-stories as a particular type of storytelling, we relocate the discussion of news stories from text to discourse, and focus on the news-story not as a work but as a working, and not as a news event but as a news-telling event. In news-storytelling activities, what may be constituted as story knowledge as the “givens” in the world of fiction is already an “argument” in the rhetorical context of news-storytelling, and is therefore subjected to the readers’ evaluation and judgment. News-stories become a discursive arena where the poetics of a story is overridden by the rhetoric of storytelling, and the suspension of disbelief is replaced by the maintenance of disbelief or contentions about the “givens.” Where we are presented with the dialogues in which a character is involved, the dramatic scenes in which he acts, and the

physical description he bears, we also find the desires and strategies of storytelling activities as the storyteller asserts, foregrounds, dramatizes, keeps silence, omits, suppresses, and distorts.

Critical practice on news-stories and other historical discourses has over-invested its attention to their being linguistic constructs, their having no discernable textual properties of their own, their using experimental and novelistic literary apparatuses, and their constructing subjective and subversive representations of historical facts. These referentiality and textuality issues, however, need not blind us to the fact that the construction of a field of (disciplinary) knowledge is not merely linguistic and formal but discursive, cognitive, and social. A story can be told in many ways, and the points of telling it may differ from each other, depending on modes of storytelling practices.

This revised outlook on the news-stories at the level of discourse offers a richer, and more integrative understanding of news-stories in a much broader discursive context of story-building, storytelling, and retelling. As a socially regulated and conditioned discourse, news-storytelling in its enterprise is predicated upon the different sets of discursive authorities, material conditions, and audience expectations, where various facts and interpretations are argued, tested, competed with, and judged. Accordingly, the act of news-storytelling does not fall on the dividing line between fiction and history, nor in the blurred zone of non-distinction, but along a spectrum from ambiguity to

certainty, speculation to verification, and fact-finding to fact-making. News-stories provide us with a clarifying, but by no means untypical, vantage point from which to understand the transactions of historical discourse, where news-storytelling replaces (story) knowledge with argument, poetics with rhetoric, and a story with a discourse.

WORKS CITED

- Abrams, Kathryn. "Hearing the Call of Stories." *California Law Review* 79.4 (1991): 971-1052.
- Algeo, Ann. *The Courtroom as Forum: Homicide Trials by Dreiser, Wright, Capote, and Mailer*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality: The New Critical Idiom*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Ankersmit, F.R. "Reply to Professor Zagorin." *History and Theory* 29 (1990): 275-296.
- Atkinson, Dwight. "Integrating Multiple Analysis in Historical Studies of Scientific Discourse: The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 1675-1975." *Essays in the Study of Scientific Discourse: Method, Practice, and Pedagogy*. Ed. John Battalio. London: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1998. 139-165.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- . *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Barringer, George. "Defoe's A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain." *Thoth* 9 (1968): 3-13.
- Barth, John. "The Literature of Exhaustion." *Metafiction*. Ed. Mark Currie.

- New York: Longman, 1995. 161-172.
- Barthes, Roland. "Historical Discourse." *Introduction to Structuralism*. Ed. Michael Lane. Trans. Peter Wexler. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- . *The Pleasure of the Text*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Noonday Press, 1973.
- . *S/Z*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wang, 1974.
- . *The Fashion System*. Richard Howard and Matthew Ward. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Bauer, Henry. "Two Kinds of Knowledge: Maps and Stories." *Journal of Scientific Exploration* 9.2 (1995): 257-275.
- Beach, Joseph. *The Twentieth Century Novel: Studies in Technique*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932.
- Bellis, Jack de. "Visions and Revisions: Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 7.3 (1979): 519-37.
- Berkhofer, Robert. "The Challenge of Poetics to (Normal) Historical Practice." *Postmodern History Reader*. Ed. Jenkins. London: Routledge, 1997. 139-155.
- Bonheim, Helmut. *The Narrative Modes: Techniques of the Short Story*. Cambridge, UK: D.S. Brewer. 1982.
- Botley, Samuel. *Maximum in Minimo: or Mr. Ieremiah Rich's Pen's Dexterity Completed. Being the Plainest & Easiest Method of Writing Short-hand ...*

London, 1705. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. 17 March 2005

<<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO>>.

Broich, Ulrich. "Intertextuality." *International Postmodernism: Theory and Literary Practice*. Ed. Hans Bertens and Douwe Fokkema. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997. 249-255.

Brooks, Cleanth and Robert Penn Warren. *Modern Rhetoric: Shorter Third Edition*. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1972.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Bruner, Jerome. *Making Stories: Law, Literature, Life*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002.

Capote, Truman. *In Cold Blood: A True Account of a Multiple Murder and Its Consequences*. New York: Signet, 1965.

Carrard, Philippe. *Poetics of the New History: French Historical Discourse from Braudel to Chartier*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

———. "Theory of a Practice: Historical Enunciation and the Annales School." *A New Philosophy of History*. Ed. Frank Ankersmit and Hans Kellner. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995. 108-126.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1978.

———. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1990.

- Clarke, Gerald. *Capote: A Biography*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988.
- Cohen, Richard. *Writer's Mind: Crafting Fiction*. Lincolnwood, Illinois: NTC Publishing Group, 1995.
- Coles, Elisha. *The Newest, Plainest and Best Short-hand Extant...* London, 1707. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. 17 March 2005
<<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO>>.
- Connery, Thomas. "Discovering a Literary Form." *A Sourcebook of American Literary Journalism: Representative Writers in an Emerging Genre*. Ed. Thomas Connery. New York: Greenwood Press, 1992. 3-37.
- Cronon, William. "A Place for Stories: Nature, History and Narrative." *Journal of American History* 78.4 (1992): 1347-76.
- Davidson, Donald. *Subjective, Intersubjective, Objective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Davis, Lennard. "Conversation and Dialogue." *The Age of Johnson* 1 (1987): 347-373.
- Defoe, Daniel. *The Family-Instructor in Three Parts*. London, 1717. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. 17 March 2005
<<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO>>.
- . *The History and Remarkable Life of the Truly Honourable Col. Jacques Commonly Call'd Col. Jack*. Ed. Samuel Monk. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965.
- . *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain*. Ed. Pat Rogers.

- Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1971.
- . *Moll Flanders*. Ed. Edward Kelly. New York: W.W.Norton and Company, 1973.
- . *Due Preparation for the Plague*. Ed. George Aitken. London: J.M. Dent and Co., 1974.
- . *Roxana*. Ed. David Blewett. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.
- . *The True and Genuine Account of the Life and Actions of the Late Jonathan Wild. Jonathan Wild*. Ed. David Nokes. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.
- . *A General History of Robberies and Murders of the Most Notorious Pirates*. New York: Carroll and Graf Publishers, Inc., 1999.
- . *The Journal of the Plague Year*. Ed. Cynthia Wall. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.
- Delgado, Richard. "Storytelling for Oppositionists and Others: A Plea for Narrative." *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*. Ed. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000. 60-70.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Doctorow, E.L. "False Document." *E.L. Doctorow: Essays and Conversations*. Ed. Trenner, Richard. New Jersey: Ontario Review Press, 1983. 16-27.
- Eagleton, Terry. "Capitalism, Modernism, and Postmodernism." *New Left Review* 152 (1985): 60-73.

- Edwards, Jane. "The Transcription of Discourse" *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Ed. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi Hamilton. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Ellis, Frank. "Defoe's Journal of the Plague Year." *The Review of English Studies, New Series* 45.177 (1994): 76-82.
- Erman, Britt. "Pragmatic Markers Revisited with a Focus on *You Know* in Adult and Adolescent Talk." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 (2001): 1337-1359.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1992.
- Faller, Lincoln. *Crime and Defoe: A New Kind of Writing*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1993.
- Farber, Daniel and Suzanne Sherry. "Telling Stories Out of School: An Essay on Legal Narratives." *Stanford Law Review* 45 (1993): 807.
- Federman, Raymond. "Surfiction — Four Propositions in Form of an Introduction." *Surfiction : Fiction Now and Tomorrow*. Chicago: Swallow Press, 1975. 5-15.
- Fiedler, Leslie. *Waiting for the End: The American Literary Scene from Hemingway to Baldwin*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1967.
- Fielding, Henry. *Joseph Andrews*. Ed. R.F. Brissenden. New York: Penguin Books, 1977.
- . *Jonathan Wild*. Ed. David Nokes. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.
- . *Tom Jones*, Ed. John Bender and Simon Stern. New York: Oxford

Univ. Press, 1996.

Foley, Barbara. *Telling the Truth: The Theory and Practice of Documentary Fiction*.

Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Foucault, Michel. Ed. "Forward." *I, Pierre Riviere, Having Slaughtered My*

Mother, My Sister and My Brother...: A Case of Parricide in the 19th Century.

New York: Penguin Books, 1978.

Frank, Jerome. *Courts on Trial: Myth and Reality in American Justice*. Princeton,

New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Frus, Phills. *The Politics and Poetics of Journalistic Narrative*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Galdfelder, Hal. *Criminality and Narrative in Eighteenth-Century England: Beyond*

the Law. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2001.

Garrison, Bruce. *Professional News Writing*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence

Erlbaum Associates, 1990.

Genette, Gerard. *Figures of Literary Discourse. European Perspectives*. New

York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1982.

———. *Fiction and Diction*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Ithaca, New York: Cornell

University Press, 1993.

Ghen, Dorothy Van. *The English Novel: Form and Function*. New York: Harper

and Row, 1953.

Goffman, Erving. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press,

1981.

Gossman, Lionel. "History and Literature: Reproduction or Signification."

Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding. Ed.

Robert H. Canary and Henry Kozicki. Madison: University of

Wisconsin Press, 1978.

Greimas, Algirdas Julien. "Actants, Actors, and Figures." *On Meaning: Selected*

Writings in Semiotic Theory. Trans. Paul J. Perron and Frank H.

Collins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987. 106-20.

Griffin, Bryan. "Low Life and High Hack." *American Spectator* 13 (1980): 12-19.

Grobel, Lawrence. *Conversation with Capote*. New York: A Plume Book, 1985.

Hall, William Keith. *From Chronicle to Chorography: Truth, Narrative, and the*

Antiquarian Enterprise in Renaissance England. Diss. The University of

North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1995. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1995. 9605120.

Hamon, Philippe. *Expositions: Literature and Architecture in Nineteenth-*

Century France. Trans. Katia Sainson-Frank and Lisa Maguire. Berkeley:

University of California Press, 1992.

Hammond, Brean. *Professional Imaginative Writing in England, 1670-1740*.

New York: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Harris, Michael. "Trials and Criminal Biographies." *Sale and Distribution of*

Books from 1700. Ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris. Oxford: Oxford

Polytechnic Press, 1982.

Hartsock, John. *A History of American Literary Journalism: The Emergence of a*

Modern Narrative Form. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press,

2000.

Hellmann, John. *Fables of Fact: The New Journalism as New Fiction*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981.

"Henry Bosworway, Killing: Murder, 20 Apr 1737." *The Proceedings of the Old Bailey London 1674 to 1834*. The Old Bailey Proceedings Online. 17 March 2005 <<http://www.oldbaileyonline.org>>.

Hersey, John. *The Algiers Motel Incident*. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

———. "The Legend on the License." *The Yale Review* 70 (1980): 1-25.

Heyne, Eric. "Toward a Theory of Literary Nonfiction." *Modern Fiction Studies* 33 (1987): 479-490.

———. "Where Fiction Meets Nonfiction: Mapping a Rough Terrain." *Narrative* 9 (2001): 322-333.

"Hickock, Smith Pay Extreme Penalty." *The Clutter Case: Original Stories & 25 Years Later KBI Agent Recounts Holcomb Tragedy*. CD-ROM. Garden City, Kansas: Kansas State Historical Society, 2002.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. "Telling It as You Like It: Postmodernist History and the Flight From Fact." *Postmodern History Reader*. Ed. Jenkins. London: Routledge, 1997. 158-174.

Hobsbawm, Eric. "The Revival of Narrative: Some Comments." *The History and Narrative Reader*. Ed. Geoffrey Roberts. New York: Routledge, 2001. 299-304.

Hollowell, John. *Fact and Fiction: The New Journalism and the Nonfiction Novel*.

Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1977.

Hunter, Paul. *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction*. New York: W.W.Norton and Company, 1990.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Iggers, Georg G. *Historiography of the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Post-Modern Challenge*. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1997.

Jameson, Fredric. "Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." *New Left Review* 146 (1984): 53-92.

Jenkins, Keith. "Introduction: On Being Open About Our Closures." *The Postmodern History Reader*. Ed. Keith Jenkins. New York: Routledge, 1997.

"Judge to Hear Appeal Here." *The Clutter Case: Original Stories & 25 Years Later KBI Agent Recounts Holcomb Tragedy*. CD-ROM. Garden City, Kansas: Kansas State Historical Society, 2002.

Keeble, Richard. *Ethics of Journalism*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Kreiswirth, Martin. "Trusting the Tale: The Narrativist Turn in the Human Sciences." *New Literary History* 23.3 (1992): 637-640.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Kryk-Kastovsky, Barbara. "Representation of Orality in Early Modern English

- Trial Records." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 1:2 (2000): 201-230.
- Langbein, John. "The Criminal Trial before the Lawyers" *The University of Chicago Law Review* 45.2 (1978): 263-316.
- Levinson, Stephen. "Putting Linguistics on a Proper Footing: Explorations in Goffman's Concepts of Participation." *Erving Goffman: Exploring the Interaction Order*. Ed. Paul Drew and Anthony Wootton. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988. 161-227.
- Lubbock, Percy. *The Craft of Fiction*. New York: The Viking Press, 1957.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- . *The Differend*. Trans. by Georges Van Den Abbeele. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1988.
- . *Postmodernism Explained: Correspondence 1982-1985*. Ed. Julian Pefanis and Morgan Thomas. Trans. Don Barry, Bernadette Maher, Julian Pefanis, Virginia Spate, and Morgan Thomas. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.
- . *Postmodern Fables*. Trans. Georges Van Den Abbeele. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1997.
- Mailer, Norman. *The Armies of the Night: History as a Novel, the Novel as History*. New York: Signet, 1968.
- . *The Spooky Art: Thoughts on Writing*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2004.

- Manso, Peter. *Mailer: His Life and Times*. New York: Penguin, 1986.
- Mayer, Robert. *History and the Early English Novel: Erudition, Ideology, and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1997.
- McGann, Jerome. "Introduction: Texts and Textualities." *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction*. New York: Methuen, 1987.
- . *Constructing Postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Mendyk, Stanley. '*Speculum Britanniae*' : *Regional study, Antiquarianism, and Science in Britain to 1700*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.
- Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Mullan, John. "Swift, Defoe, and Narrative Forms." *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1650-1740*. Ed. Steven N. Zwicker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 250-275.
- Mushin, Ilana. "Evidentiality and Deixis in Narrative Retelling." *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (2000): 927-957.
- Nicholson, Watson. *The Historical Sources of Defoe's Journal of the Plague Year*. New York: Kennikat Press, Inc., 1966.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life." *Untimely Meditations*. Ed. Daniel Breazeale. Trans. R. J. Hollingdale. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. 59-123.
- Norris, Christopher. *Uncritical Theory: Postmodernism, Intellectuals and*

- the Gulf War*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.
- O'Donnell, Patrick and Robert Con Davis. *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Olabarri, Ignacio. "'New' New History: A Longue Duree Structure." *History and Theory* 34.1 (1995): 1-29.
- Ong, Walter. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Methuen, 1982.
- Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Dabates and Contexts*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2003.
- Patterson, James. "Americans and the Writing of Twentieth-Century United States History." *Imagined Histories*. Ed. Anthony Molho and Gordon S. Wood. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Pfister, Manfred. "How Postmodern is Intertextuality?" *Intertextuality*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991. 207-224.
- Piggot, Stuart. *Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination : Ideas from the Renaissance to the Regency*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1989.
- Plimpton, George. *Truman Capote*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- . "The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel." *Truman Capote's In Cold Blood: A Critical Handbook*. Ed. Irving Malin. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1968. 25-43.
- Posner, Richard. "Narrative and Narratology in Classroom and Courtroom." *Philosophy and Literature* 21.2 (1997): 292-305.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Trans. Lawrence Scott. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968.

Richetti, John. "Popular Narrative in the Early Eighteenth Century: Formats and Formulas." *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 29 (1985): 3-39.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: The Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

Rogers, Pat. "Literary Art in Defoe's Tour" *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 6.2 (1972-3): 153-185.

Rollyson, Carl. *The Lives of Norman Mailer*. New York: Paragon House, 1991.

Rosenstone, Robert. "Prologue: Who and Why." *Mirror in the Shrine: American Encounters with Meiji Japan*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Runyon, Randolph. *Reading Raymond Carver*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1992.

Ryan, Marie-Laure "Postmodernism and the Doctrine of Panfictionality." *Narrative* 5.2 (1997): 165-87.

———. "Narrative in Real Time: Chronicle, Mimesis and Plot in the Baseball Broadcast." *Narrative* 1.2 (1993): 138-55.

Rygiel, Dennis. "On the Neglect of Twentieth Century Nonfiction: A Writing Teacher's View." *College English* 46 (1984): 392-400.

Sauter, Van Gordon and Burleigh Hines' *Nightmare in Detroit: A Rebellion and its Victims*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1968.

- Schafer, Roy. "Narration in the Psychoanalytic Dialogue." *On Narrative*.
Ed. W.J.T. Mitchell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Schama, Simon. *Dead Certainties (Unwarranted Speculations)*. New York: Alfred
A. Knopf, 1991.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Scholes, Robert. *The Fabulators*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- "Seek Stays for Hickock, Smith." *The Clutter Case: Original Stories & 25 Years
Later KBI Agent Recounts Holcomb Tragedy*. CD-ROM. Garden City,
Kansas: Kansas State Historical Society, 2002.
- Sherwood, Hugh. *The Journalistic Interview*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Skinner, John. "Ghosts and Special Features: Daniel Defoe and New
Journalism." *Alarums and Excursions: Working Papers in English*. Turku,
Finland: University of Turku, 1990.
- Smith, Ron. *Groping for Ethics in Journalism*. Iowa City, Iowa: Iowa State Press,
2003.
- Stanford, Michael. *A Companion to the Study of History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Stevick, Phillip, Ed. *The Theory of the Novel*. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- Stone, Lawrence. "Prosopography." *Historical Studies Today*. Ed. Felix Gilbert
and Stephen R. Graubard. New York: W. W. Norton, 1971. 107-40.
- Sukenick, Ronald. "The Death of the Novel." *The Death of the Novel and Other
Stories*. New York: Dial Place, 1969. 3-17.
- Tanner, Francis. *The Plainest, Easiest, and Prettiest Method of Writing Short-hand*,

- Ever Yet Published*. London, 1712. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. 17 March 2005 <<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/ECCO>>.
- "Thomas Nash, Killing: Murder, 12 Apr 1727." *The Proceedings of the Old Bailey London 1674 to 1834*. The Old Bailey Proceedings Online. 17 March 2005 <<http://www.oldbaileyonline.org>>.
- Trilling, Diana. "Capote's Crime and Punishment." *Truman Capote's In Cold Blood: A Critical Handbook*. Ed. Irving Malin. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1968. 107-113.
- Tynan, Kenneth. "The Kansas Farm Murders." *The Critical Response to Truman Capote*. Ed. Joseph J. Waldmeir, and John C. Waldmeir. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 1999. 130-134.
- Volosinov, V.N. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.
- Wall, Cynthia. "Details of Space: Narrative Description in Early Eighteenth-Century Novels." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 10.4 (1998): 387-405.
- . "Grammars of Space: The Language of London from Stow's Survey to Defoe's Tour." *Philosophical Quarterly* 76.4 (1997): 387-411.
- . "Rhetoric of Description and the Spaces of Things" *Eighteenth-Century Genre and Culture*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2001.
- Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. New York: Methuen, 1984.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century*

- Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975
- . *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- . *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- . "Figuring the Nature of Times Deceased." *Future Literary Theory*. Ed. Ralph Cohen. New York: Routledge, 1989. 19-43.
- Willis, Jim. *The Human Journalist: Reporters, Perspectives, and Emotions*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2003.
- Winter, Joanne. "Discourse Quotatives in Australian English: Adolescents Performing Voices." *Australian Journal of Linguistics*. 22.1 (2002): 5-21.
- Wolf, Werner. "Nature, Landscapes, and the Early English Novel." *Comparative Literature Now*. Paris: Champion, 1999.
- Wolfe, Tom. "The New Journalism." *The New Journalism*. Ed. Tom Wolfe and E. W. Johnson. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973. 3-52.
- Woolf, D.R. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1990.
- Zavarzadeh, Mas'ud. *Mythopoetic Reality: The Postwar American Nonfiction Novel*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976.
- Zimbardo, Rose. "The Late Seventeenth-Century Dilemma in Discourse: Dryden's Don Sebastian and Behn's Oroonoko." *Rhetorics of Order/Ordering Rhetorics in English Neoclassical Literature*. Ed. Douglas

Canfield and Paul Hunter. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989.

46-67.

VITA

Jungsik Park earned the Bachelor of Arts degree in English from Sogang University in Seoul in 1994, the Master of Arts degree in English from Queens College, City University of New York in 1999, and the Doctor of Philosophy degree from Texas A&M University in 2006. To support his work on this project, he received a Dissertation Research Award from the College of Liberal Arts, Texas A&M University, a Stipendiary Graduate Fellowship from the Melbern G. Glasscock Center for Humanities Research, and the Forrest Burt Memorial Award from the English Department.

His major field of study is Twentieth-Century American Literature, and his research interests include narratology, discourse studies, historiography, new journalism, and crime stories. Jungsik Park may be reached at the Department of English c/o Dr. David McWhirter, TAMU MS 4227, College Station, TX 77843-4227. Jungsik Park's email address is narrativist@yahoo.com.